Iowa Reading First:
External Evaluator Final Report
Grades K-4
2005-2006

Prepared by
Psychology in Education Research Lab
Iowa State University
Arlene de la Mora
Faith Lichoro
Bernice Dodor
Gary D. Phye

Table of Contents

Results of Year1 (Fall 2003) and Year3 (Spring 2006) School and Student Reading Performance (Trend)

Executive Summary

Program Description. Reading First is a focused nationwide effort to enable all students to become successful early readers. The goal is to improve the reading achievement through high-quality, comprehensive reading instruction in kindergarten through grade 3. The Iowa Reading First program builds upon a solid foundation of research designed to select, implement, and provide professional development for teachers using scientifically based reading programs. The program also ensures accountability through ongoing, valid and reliable screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based assessment.

There are currently 55 school buildings within 30 districts participating in the Iowa Reading First Program. In 2005-2006, approximately 7,171 students in grades one through three participated in the program. The following is an overview of the activities that took place in 2005-2006.

Data Collection: Iowa Reading First Data Collection site was available for data entry in the fall between September 1 and November 17, 2005. In the spring, the data collection site was open for data collection between January 9, 2006 and May 7, 2006. Because schools that administer their ITBS in spring were not expected to receive their scores by May 1, 2006, the data collection for ITBS ended on May 31, 2006.

Performance Benchmarks*:* During the 2005-2006 school year, there were 40 performance benchmarks that schools could meet compared to 28 performance benchmarks possible during the 2004-2005 school year. The increase reflects 12 performance benchmarks possible on ITBS assessments (six), first grade BRI assessments (four), and second grade Phonics assessments (two). The number of performance benchmarks met by schools ranged from 39 to 16 (see Table 4). Three school buildings met between 36-39 performance benchmarks; 13 school buildings met between 30-35 performance benchmarks; 14 school building met between 24-29; and 22 school buildings met between 16-23 performance benchmarks.

In general, the majority (88% to 100%) of schools met their performance benchmarks in phonological awareness (i.e., rhyming, deletion, blending, segmentation, isolation and substitution) and phonics (graphemes and decoding) among their kindergarten and first grade students (see Table 4).

The majority of schools also met their performance benchmarks in phonics (graphemes, 94% and decoding, 88%) among second grade students. The majority of schools also met their performance benchmarks on comparisons of 2nd grade student performance in Fall 2003 (Year1) and Fall 2005 (Year2) in phonics (graphemes, 98%, decoding 96%).

Students in first, second and third grade continue to need support with fluency. The majority (60%-85%) of the participating schools *did not* meet their performance benchmarks in fluency. The percentage of schools meeting their performance benchmarks in fluency increased by 7% for second graders but decreased by 2% for third graders between Spring 2005 (Year 2) and Spring 2006 (Year 3). Less than half of the schools met their performance benchmarks on similar comparisons made for first graders between Year2 and Year3 (38% of schools met their performance benchmark), Year1 and Year3 (48% of schools met their performance benchmark).

The majority of schools also made their performance benchmarks on BRI Comprehension for second (79%) and third graders (87%). However, this represents a decrease of 2% for second graders and 3% for third graders from the percentage of schools that met their benchmarks last year. The percentage of schools meeting their performance benchmarks on similar comparisons made for first graders ranged from 40% on Year2 to Year3 comparisons, 52% on Year1 to Year3 comparisons, and 94% on a cohort group comparison between first grade students in Year1 compared to their performance as third grade students in Year 3.

Schools also continue to need for support on ITBS NPR subtests. The majority of schools (54-71%) *did not* meet their performance benchmarks on the ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary and ITBS Reading Total subtests for their third and fourth grade students. More schools met their performance benchmarks in ITBS Comprehension (50%), ITBS Vocabulary (33%) and ITBS Reading Total (52%) cohort group comparisons between third grade students in Year2 compared to their performance as fourth grade students in Year 3.

Greatest Gains: Every year the United States Department of Education requires states to determine schools participating in Reading First who have made the greatest gains in student achievement. Schools that achieved at least 73% or more of their Performance Benchmarks and at least three of six ITBS year 1 and year 3 comparisons were identified has having made the greatest gains. In 2005-2006, seven schools participating in Iowa Reading First were identified as making the greatest gains: Clearfield CSD, New Market Elementary; Sioux City CSD, Everett Elementary; Malvern CSD, Chantry Elementary; Sentral CSD, Sentral Elementary; Wall Lake View Auburn CSD, Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary, Russell CSD, Russell Elementary; Ottumwa CSD, James Elementary (see section on Greatest Gains for more complete information).

Successful Schools: This year, the Iowa Department of Education identified schools that have been successful at increasing the percentage of students proficient on various reading assessments. Schools that achieved 23 (76%) or more of the 30 successful school indicators with 75% of students proficient and/or were identified as having made the greatest gains in 2005-2006 school year were identified as identified as "successful schools" (see Table 7). The successful schools identified were Albert City-Truesdale Elementary, Alden Elementary, Chariton-Columbus/Van Allen Elementary, Diagonal Elementary, Fremont Elementary, Malvern-Chantry Elementary, Ottumwa James Elementary, Russell Elementary, Sentral Elementary, Sigourney Elementary, Sioux City-Everett Elementary, Twin Rivers Elementary, and Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary.

Year3 (2005-2006) Student Performance: The percentage of students proficient in reading increased between fall and spring 2005-2006 semesters on PAT (rhyming, deletion, blending, segmentation, isolation, and substitution), Phonics (graphemes and decoding), and BRI (fluency and comprehension) assessments. On PAT assessments, the majority of kindergarten (ranging from 79%-90%) and first grade students (ranging from 90-97%) are proficient in their skills in Spring 2006. In Phonics, the majority of first graders are proficient in graphemes (88%) and decoding (93%) in Spring 2006.

Among first and second grade students, 55% are proficient on BRI fluency and 59% are proficient on BRI comprehension. Among third graders, 45% of third graders are proficient on BRI fluency and 77% are proficient on BRI comprehension.

Over half of third and fourth grade students are proficient on their ITBS NPR subtests. The majority of third grade students (61%) were proficient on ITBS Comprehension, 57% were proficient on ITBS Vocabulary, and 60% were proficient on ITBS Reading Total scores. The majority (65%) of fourth grade students were also proficient on ITBS Comprehension and ITBS Reading Total; 60% were proficient on ITBS Vocabulary. Although the majority of students are proficient, these percentages reflect a small drop in the percentage of students proficient on each subtest (ranging from 1%-6% decrease on each subtest).

Student performance was also examined by student subgroups (ie., gender, students *with* disabilities, students *with* limited English proficiency, students *with* an economic disadvantage, and students from major racial/ethnic categories). Overall, female students had a higher percentage of students proficient between semesters and across years on the majority of various assessments collected. In most cases, males were able to narrow the achievement gap on the assessments. The female/male achievement gap widened, however, for the following students: Kindergarten students on PAT Deletion; second and third grade students on BRI fluency and BRI comprehension; third and fourth grade students on ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total; and a third-fourth grade cohort group on ITBS Vocabulary.

Students *with* an economic disadvantage were able to narrow the achievement gap when their performance was compared to students *without* an economic disadvantage increasing the percentage of students proficient between semesters and across years on the majority of assessments collected. The achievement gap between students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage widened for the following students: second grade students in PAT decoding; second and third grade students on BRI fluency; fourth grade students on ITBS Comprehension; third grade students on ITBS Vocabulary; third and fourth grade students on ITBS Reading Total; and a third-fourth grade cohort group on ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total.

Students *with* a limited English proficiency were able to narrow the achievement gap when their performance was compared to students *without* a limited English proficiency increasing the percentage of students proficient between semesters and across years on the majority of assessments collected. The achievement gap between students *with* a limited English proficiency and *without* a limited English proficiency widened for the following students: second grade students on BRI fluency, BRI comprehension, PAT Graphemes and PAT Decoding (although both groups had a large percentage of students proficient on PAT Graphemes and PAT Decoding ranging from 77%-90%); third grade students on ITBS Vocabulary, ITBS Reading Total, and a third-fourth grade cohort group on ITBS Vocabulary.

The achievement gap between students *with* and *without* disabilities was narrowed on approximately one-third of the assessments administered between semesters and across years. The achievement gap widened between students *with* and *without* disabilities for the following students: Kindergarten students on PAT Rhyming and PAT Deletion; first grade students on PAT Deletion, PAT Blending, BRI comprehension; second and third grade students on BRI fluency and BRI comprehension; third and fourth grade students on ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total, and a third-fourth grade cohort group on ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total.

The achievement gap between students from major race/ethnic group was examined by comparing student performance between White students and students from one of the four other major race/ethnic groups (i.e., Native American, Asian, Black/African-American, or Hispanic/Latino). The percentage of Asian students meeting proficiency on the various reading assessment is similar to the percentage of White students meeting proficiency.

The achievement gap between Native American and White students narrowed on most of the assessments administered between semesters and across years. Native American students had a higher percentage of students proficient than White students on some measures (e.g., first grade PAT Substitution, PAT Graphemes, PAT Decoding). On other measures, the achievement gap between these two groups widened: first grade students on PAT Rhyming, BRI fluency and BRI Comprehension; second grade PAT Graphemes; PAT Decoding; third grade BRI Comprehension, and third grade students on ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total; and a third-fourth grade cohort group on ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total.

The achievement gap between Hispanic/Latino and White students narrowed on most of the assessments administered between semesters and across years. The achievement gap widened for the following students: second grade students on BRI Fluency, BRI Comprehension; third grade and third-fourth grade cohort students on ITBS Vocabulary and ITBS Reading Total.

The achievement gap between Black/African-American and White students narrowed on most of the assessments administered between semesters and across years. The achievement gap widened for the following students: first grade students on PAT Graphemes, BRI fluency, and BRI comprehension; second grade students on BRI fluency and BRI Comprehension; third grade students on BRI Comprehension, ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, and ITBS Reading Total; and a third-fourth grade cohort group on ITBS Comprehension and ITBS Vocabulary.

Fall 2003 – Spring 2006 Student Performance (Trend): Fall 2003 student performance was compared to Spring 2006 student performance. Overall the percentage of students proficient in reading increased between the initial implementation of Reading First in Fall 2003 and the last semester (Spring 2006) of the third year of implementation (see Table 14).

The percentage of students proficient in reading increased between Fall 2003 and Spring 2006 on PAT (rhyming, deletion, blending, segmentation, isolation, and substitution), Phonics (graphemes and decoding), and BRI (fluency and comprehension) assessments. On PAT assessments, the percentage of students proficient increased among kindergarten (ranging from 30-39%) and first grade (ranging from 27-33%) students between Fall 2003 and Spring 2006. In Phonics, first grade students increased the percentage of students proficient on graphemes by 33% and decoding by34%; second grade students increased the percentage of students proficient on graphemes by 20% and decoding by 19%.

The percentage of students proficient also increased on BRI Fluency (first graders by 16%, second graders by 16%, third graders by 8%) and BRI Comprehension (first graders by 12%, second graders by 37%, and third graders by 40%).

The percentage of students proficient on ITBS subtests also increased between Year1 and Year3. The percentage of student proficient increased on ITBS Comprehension (third graders by 24%,

fourth graders by 3%), ITBS Vocabulary (third graders by 20%, fourth graders by 3%) and ITBS Reading Total (third graders by 23%, fourth graders by 4%).

Student performance between Fall 2003 and Spring 2006 was also examined by student subgroups (ie., gender, students *with* disabilities, students *with* limited English proficiency, student *with* an economic disadvantage, and students from major racial/ethnic categories). Female students have a higher percentage of students proficient on the all of the assessment than male students. Males were able to narrow the achievement gap for the majority of assessments administered. However, the achievement gap widened for this subgroup: kindergarten students on PAT Rhyming and PAT Deletion; second grade students on PAT Decoding, BRI Fluency, BRI Comprehension; third grade students on BRI Fluency; and fourth grade students on ITBS Vocabulary.

Students *with* an economic disadvantage were able to narrow the achievement gap on most of the assessment administered compared to students *without* an economic disadvantage. The achievement gap widened for this subgroup: first grade students on BRI Fluency, BRI Comprehension; second grade students on BRI Fluency, BRI comprehension, third grade students on BRI Fluency, ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, ITBS Reading Total; and fourth grade students on ITBS Vocabulary, ITBS Reading Total.

Students *with* a limited English proficiency were able to narrow the achievement gap on all assessments administered compared to students *without* a limited English proficiency with the exception of second grade BRI Comprehension.

Students *with* disabilities were also able to narrow the achievement gap on all assessments administered compared to students *without* disabilities. The achievement gap widened for: kindergarten students on PAT Deletion; first grade students on BRI Fluency, BRI Comprehension; second grade students on BRI Fluency, BRI Comprehension; third grade students on ITBS Comprehension and ITBS Vocabulary; fourth grade students on ITBS Vocabulary.

The achievement gap between students from major race/ethnic group was examined by comparing student performance between White students and students from one of the four other major race/ethnic groups (i.e., Native American, Asian, Black/African-American, or Hispanic/Latino; see Tables 15a and 15b). The percentage of Asian students meeting proficiency on the various reading assessment is similar to the percentage of White students meeting proficiency.

The achievement gap between Hispanic/Latino and White students narrowed on the majority of assessments administered. The achievement gap widened for: second grade students on PAT Decoding and BRI Comprehension.

The achievement gap between Native Americans and White students also narrowed on the majority of assessments administered. The achievement gap widened for: kindergarten students on PAT Rhyming; first grade students on BRI Fluency, BRI Comprehension; second grade students on PAT Decoding and BRI Comprehension.

The achievement gap between Black/African-American and White students widened on the majority of assessments administered. The achievement gap widened for: kindergarten students on PAT Blending; first grade students on PAT Rhyming, PAT Deletion, PAT Substitution, PAT Graphemes, PAT Decoding; second grade students on PAT Decoding, BRI Fluency; third grade students on BRI Fluency, ITBS Comprehension, ITBS Vocabulary, ITBS Reading Total; fourth grade students on ITBS Vocabulary and ITBS Reading Total.

Special Education Services: Data was collected to assess the number of students receiving Special Education services, the number of students referred to pre-referral services, and the number of pre-referrals that resulted in an IEP for students. With the exception of 2nd graders, the percentage of students receiving special education services decreased by 1%-3% for Kindergarten, 1st and 3rd graders or remained constant (i.e., no change) for 4th graders between the 2004-2005 and the 2005-2006 school years.

Overall, the percentage of students referred for pre-referral services decreased by 1%-3% between the 2004-2005 and the 2005-2006 school years for all grades. With the exception of kindergarten students (change remained constant), the percentage of students that had an IEP initiated and placed in special education services decreased by 1%-2% for 1st-4th grade students.

Overview of Iowa Reading First State Evaluation Student Data Collection

Web-based Data Collection Center

Central to the evaluation of the Iowa Reading First Program is the collection of student data. Reading First participants entered data on a secure (password-protected) web-based data collection center. To assist schools to navigate through the web site (e.g., data entry, running reports, charts), support is provided by the Iowa Department of Education and the external evaluator along with a user manual that is easy to follow. Training is provided as needed.

Student data is collected two times per year (fall and spring) aligned with the Data Collection Plan. Tests administered include the Phonological Awareness Test (PAT), Basic Reading Inventory (BRI), and Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). A description of these tests is provided in the following section, *Description of Reading Measures*. The *Assessment by Grades Level, Reading First State Evaluation Schedule* indicates which tests are administered in the fall and spring by grade.

Sociodemographic data is also collected on each student. Sociodemographic data collected includes gender, students *with*/*without* disabilities, major race/ethnic categories, students *with* economic advantage/disadvantage, and students *with*/*without* English limited proficiency. In addition, specific information regarding special education status, referral for pre-referral services is also collected. These sociodemographic data allows tests scores to be disaggregated by these five subgroups.

Description of Reading Measures

Phonological Awareness Test (Phonological Awareness and Phonics)

The Phonological Awareness Test is a normed referenced test designed to assess phonological processing and phoneme-grapheme correspondence (Robertson & Salter, 1997). The following phonological processing subtests are administered to kindergarten and first grade students: rhyming, deletion, and blending. Some of the phonological processing subtests may not be appropriate for all five year olds; therefore, the following subtests are only administered to first graders: segmentation, isolation, and substitution.

The phonics subtests (graphemes and decoding) are administered to first graders in the fall and spring. For scoring purposes, students who are proficient in phonological processing and phoneme-grapheme correspondence are not re-tested during subsequent testing. A presumption is made that students whose scores indicate they are proficient in a particular subtest have mastered this skill and no longer require testing. Therefore, the number of students who pass in the fall are added to the number of student who passed in the spring.

Basic Reading Inventory (Reading Fluency and Comprehension)

To assess student achievement in reading fluency and comprehension, the Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) is administered to second and third graders in the fall and spring. The BRI is an informal reading assessment test comprised of a series of graded word lists and graded passages

that can be used to gain insight into these areas (Johns, 2001). Student scores reported reflect whether students were independent at their current grade level in fluency and comprehension.

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills is an achievement battery of tests comprised of various subject areas that have been standardized within the same group of students (Hoover, H., Dunbar, S., Frisbie, D., Oberley, K., Bray, R., Naylor, J., Lewis, J., Ordman, V., & Qualls, A.L., 2003).

National and Iowa percentile rank scores are derived for each of the following reading subject areas: vocabulary, comprehension, and reading total. The vocabulary test is a measure of a students' reading vocabulary. The comprehension test assesses three main skills: Factual Understanding, Inference and Interpretation, and Analysis and Generalization. The reading total subtest assesses the extent of student's development in reading comprehension.
Students in the third and fourth grades are administered the ITBS once during the fall, winter, or spring of each school year. Districts/schools determine the time of the year it is administered in their respective districts/schools.

Assessments By Grade Level: Iowa Reading First Evaluation Schedule

The following table indicates the tests required in Fall and Spring by grade for Reading First State Evaluation purposes.

Table 1. Iowa Reading First Assessment Schedule

	FALL					SPRING				
TEST	**K**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**K**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Phonological Awareness Test										
Rhyming	X	X				X	X			
Deletion	X	X				X	X			
Blending	X	X				X	X			
Segmentation		X					X			
Isolation		X					X			
Substitution		X					X			
Phonics										
Graphemes		X	X				X			
Decoding		X	X				X			
BRI										
Fluency (Grade level passage)			X	X			X	X	X	
Comprehension (Grade level passage)			X	X			X	X	X	
ITBS										
Reading Total (NPR & IPR)				See Note					See Note	
Reading Comprehension (NPR & IPR)										
Vocabulary (NPR & IPR)										

Note: ITBS is required for 3rd and 4th graders; however it is only administered once per year. Schools determine when the ITBS is administered.

Student Level Descriptors

Scores on each of the assessments administered to students participating in the Iowa Reading First Initiative are converted to student level descriptors (e.g., at grade level, needs additional intervention, needs substantial intervention). Table 2 indicates the cut points on each of the reading assessments when scores are converted to the student level descriptors. In addition, these student level descriptors provide information regarding the instructional needs for planning classroom instruction and for developing quality intervention plans for children who are at risk for reading difficulty.

The goal of the Reading First Initiative is for all students to be at grade level in each of the reading subtests administered. These descriptors assist buildings, teachers, parents, and technical assistance providers a structured way of monitoring movement in student achievement in each of the five essential components (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension).

Table 2. Test Types and Student Levels

Test	At Grade Level	Needs Additional Intervention	Needs Substantial Intervention
Phonological Awareness Test (PAT)	26th percentile rank or above*	17th to 25th percentile rank*	16th percentile rank or below*
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) *Fluency*	50th percentile rank or above	26th to 49th percentile rank	25th percentile rank or below
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) *Reading Comprehension*	Independent Level: 0–1½ comprehension questions missed	Instructional Level: 2–4 comprehension questions missed	Frustration Level: 4½ or more comprehension questions missed
Iowa Test of Basic Skills *(For each subtest)*	41st percentile rank or above	20th to 40th percentile rank	19th percentile rank or below

Note: * Percentile ranks are calculated for each of the PAT subtests (6 phonological awareness and 2 phonics subtests)

Web-based Reports

Schools and districts have the ability to generate building/district level reports. Report options include the number and percentage of students at grade level (agl), need of additional intervention (nai), and need substantial intervention (nsi) by test and by grade.

Results can be disaggregated by the five categories (i.e., gender, economic advantage/disadvantage, students *with/without* disabilities, student *with*/*without* limited English proficiency, major race/ethnic categories) identified in the federal Reading First funding requirements.

Buildings/districts also have chart options that include percentage of students proficient by test, trend lines of the percentage of students by time, percentage of students proficient by the disaggregated groups, and the percentage of students at or below proficiency by time. Both reports and charts can be generated and dropped into a manuscript or Word document.

Understanding Performance Benchmarks and their use for Reading First Schools

Purpose of performance benchmarks. For Reading First Schools, performance benchmarking is used to determine if there is a statistically significant increase in the proportion of students attaining proficiency and to determine a building's funding status.

How do we determine whether performance benchmarks have been met? Schools can meet their performance benchmarks in one of two ways. The first method involves a statistical comparison of the percentage of students proficient in the fall to the percentage of students proficient in the spring. The second method involves determining whether 75% (70% on Iowa Tests of Basic Skills) or more of the students were proficient in the spring.

The percentage of students proficient in the fall is statistically compared to the percentage of students proficient in the spring. Schools that achieve a statistically significant increase between fall and spring are coded as having met their performance benchmark. Comparisons are made by test and by grade.

When schools do not meet their performance benchmarks statistically, the second method of assessment is used. Schools with 75% or more of their students proficient in the spring are coded as having met their performance benchmark. This assessment is made by test and by grade. The second method is used because some schools will not be able to statistically increase the percentage of students proficient from fall to spring. In particular, *school size* and the *percentage of students proficient at baseline* may affect whether schools are able to increase the percentage of students proficient in the spring statistically. Sample size affects significance testing and smaller schools may have greater difficulty meeting their performance benchmark statistically (see "Sample size influences whether statistically significant differences are achieved"). Other schools will not be able to significantly increase the percentage of students proficient in the spring because they have a relatively large percentage of students who are proficient on their tests at baseline (e.g., fall). As a result these schools will make smaller gains in the spring making it impossible to achieve a statistically significant difference. However, the percentage of students proficient at these schools may be greater than the percentage of students proficient among some of the schools that achieved statistical significance.

Understanding Greatest Gains and their use for Reading First Schools

To identify schools that achieved the greatest gains in reading achievement during the 2005-2006 school year, the total percentage of Performance Benchmarks met were used in conjunction with ITBS Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Reading Total NPR student test scores. ITBS

Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Reading Total NPR student test scores were converted to student level descriptors (i.e., at grade level, needs additional intervention, needs substantial intervention). The percentage of students at grade level in 2003-2004 and 2005-2006 for each test were calculated. Student scores were then calculated to obtain the difference in percentage of students proficient on ITBS from year1 of Reading First implementation (2003-2004) to year3 of Reading First implementation (2005-2006). Descriptive statistical analyses were used to determine the mean and standard deviation of each test.

Results for each school were analyzed by grade (grade 3 to 3 and grade 4 to 4) and test. Schools received a score of 1 for each grade and test in which student performance improved at least one standard deviation at grade level. The highest overall total score that a school could receive was 6. The Iowa Department of Education made the decision that a school would need to have demonstrated significant student achievement on at least three of the six comparisons and achieve 73% or more of their Performance Benchmarks.

Student Data Analysis Described

On a yearly basis, the test data and demographic data are analyzed to determine progress made by schools to increase the percentage of students proficient in reading as well as narrowing the achievement gap between groups (e.g., students *with* disabilities versus students *without* disabilities).

Schools are evaluated to determine whether they were able to meet performance benchmarks on each test (by grade). Schools can meet performance benchmarks in one of two ways. The first method involves a statistical comparison of the percentage of students proficient in the fall to the percentage of students proficient in the spring. The second method involves determining whether 75% (70% for ITBS) or more of the students were proficient in the spring. (For more information see section on Performance Benchmarks Met).

RESULTS OF SCHOOL AND STUDENT READING PERFORMANCE

School Performance Results (Fall, 2005 – Spring, 2006)

Analysis of Performance Benchmarks Met (See Tables 3, 4)

During the 2005-2006 school year, there were 40 performance benchmarks that schools could meet compared to 28 performance benchmarks possible during the 2004-2005 school year. The increase reflects 12 additional performance benchmarks possible on ITBS assessments (six), first grade BRI (4), and second grade Phonics assessments (two).

The number of performance benchmarks met by schools ranged from 39 to 16 (see Table 3). Three school buildings met between 36-39 performance benchmarks; 13 school buildings met between 30-35 performance benchmarks; 14 school building met between 24-29; and 22 school buildings met between 16-23 performance benchmarks. All buildings met 16 or more performance benchmarks.

Table 3. Number of PB Met by Number of School Buildings

Number of Buildings	Number of PB Met	Number of Buildings	Number of PB Met	Number of Buildings	Number of PB Met
0	40/40	1	31/40	3	22/40
1	39/40	2	30/40	5	21/40
0	38/40	2	29/40	4	20/40
1	37/40	4	28/40	4	19/40
1	36/40	2	27/40	2	18/40
0	35/40	0	26/40	1	17/40
1	34/40	2	25/40	2	16/40
4	33/40	4	24/40		
5	32/40	1	23/40		

Performance Benchmarks, PAT Assessments. Comparisons of the percentage of students proficient in Fall, 2005 to the percentage of students proficient in Spring, 2006 indicate that the majority of schools were able to meet their performance benchmarks on their phonological awareness subscales (see Table 4). Among kindergarten students, 100%, 88%, and 96% of the schools met their performance benchmarks on PAT Rhyming, Deletion, and Blending respectively. All of the schools (100%) met their performance benchmarks on PAT Deletion, Segmentation, and Substitution; 98% of schools met their performance benchmarks on PAT Rhyming, Blending, Isolation, Graphemes, and 96% of schools met their performance benchmarks on PAT Decoding for first grade students.

Comparisons of 2nd grade student performance in Fall 2004-2005 (year2) and 2nd grade student performance in 2005-2006 (Year3) on Phonics Graphemes and Phonics Decoding were made (see Table 4). The majority of schools met their performance benchmarks on Graphemes (94%) and Decoding (88%).

Comparisons of 2nd grade student performance in Fall 2003-2004 (year1) and 2nd grade student performance in 2005-2006 (Year3) on Phonics Graphemes and Phonics Decoding were made (see Table 4). The majority of schools met their performance benchmarks on Graphemes (98%) and Decoding (96%) respectively.

Performance Benchmarks, BRI Assessments. The majority of schools met their performance benchmarks on BRI comprehension. Among participating schools, 79% and 87% met their benchmarks for 2nd and 3rd grade students respectively (see Table 4). The percentage of schools meeting their performance benchmarks dropped when comparing progress measured with BRI Fluency. Under half (40%) and less than one-fifth (15%) of schools met their performance benchmarks for 2nd and 3rd grades.

Comparisons of 1st grade student performance in Spring 2004-2005 (year2) and 1st grade student performance in 2005-2006 (Year3) on BRI Fluency and BRI Comprehension were made. Less than half of the schools met their performance benchmarks on Comprehension (40%) and Fluency (38%).

Comparisons of 1st grade student performance in Spring 2003-2004 (year1) and 1st grade student performance in 2005-2006 (Year3) on BRI Fluency and BRI Comprehension were also made. About half of the schools met their performance benchmarks on Comprehension (52%) and Fluency (48%).

A cohort group was also compared on 1st grade student performance in Spring 2003-2004 (year1) and 3rdst grade student performance in Spring 2005-2006 (Year3) on BRI Fluency and BRI Comprehension. Only students present at both time points were included in the analysis. The majority of schools (94%) met their performance benchmark on Comprehension and about one-third (31%) of the schools met their performance benchmark on Fluency.

Performance Benchmarks on ITBS Assessments.

Performance on ITBS Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Reading Total was also compared between 2004-2005 (Year2) and 2005-2006 (Year3) school years (see Table 4). Comparisons were made between 3rd grade performance in year2 and 3rd grade performance in year3, 4th grade performance in year2 and 4th grade performance in year3, and 3rd grade performance in year2 and 4th grade performance in year3. When comparing 3rd to 4th grade performance, only students who were present in both years were included in the analysis. In comprehension, 29%, 44%, and 50% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd, 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparison respectively. In vocabulary, 37%, 31%, and 33% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd, 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparison respectively. In reading total skills , 31%, 46%, and 52% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd, 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparison respectively.

Performance on ITBS Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Reading Total was also compared between 2003-2004 (Year1) and 2005-2006 (Year3) school years (see Table 4). Comparisons were made between 3rd grade performance in year1 and 3rd grade performance in year3, and 4th grade performance in year1 and 4th grade performance in year3. In comprehension, 33% and 46% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd and 4th grade comparisons respectively. In vocabulary, 38% and 37% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for

3rd and 4th grade comparisons respectively. In reading, 35% and 46% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd and 4th grade comparisons respectively.

Table 4. Reading First Performance Benchmarks Met Totals: All Schools

2005-2006 (Year 3)

PAT/BRI PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS MET WITHIN YEARS by TEST	Performance Benchmark Met 2005-2006 (Year 3)***							
	Grade							
	K		1		2		3	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
PAT Rhyming	52	100%	51	98%				
PAT Deletion	46	88%	52	100%				
PAT Blending	50	96%	51	98%				
PAT Segmentation			52	100%				
PAT Isolation			51	98%				
PAT Substitution			52	100%				
PAT Graphemes			51	98%				
PAT Decoding			50	96%				
BRI Fluency					21	40%	8	15%
BRI Comprehension					41	79%	45	87%

PAT/BRI PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS MET ACROSS YEARS by TEST	2004-2005 (Year 2) to 2005-2006 (Year 3)***				2003-2004 (Year 1) to 2005-2006 (Year 3)***					
	Grade				Grade					
	Grade 1 (Y2) to Grade 1 (Y3)		Grade 2 (Y2) to Grade 2 (Y3)		Grade 1 (Y1) to Grade 1 (Y3)		Grade 1 (Y1) to Grade 3 (Y3)		Grade 2 (Y1) to Grade 2 (Y3)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
PAT Graphemes			49	94%					51	98%
PAT Decoding			46	88%					50	96%
BRI Fluency	20	38%			25	48%	16	31%		
BRI Comprehension	21	40%			27	52%	49	94%		

ITBS PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS MET ACROSS YEARS by TEST	2004-2005 (Year 2) to 2005-2006 (Year 3)***						2003-2004 (Year 1) to 2005-2006 (Year 3)***			
	Grade						Grade			
	Grade 3 (Y2) to Grade 3 (Y3)		Grade 4 (Y2) to Grade 4 (Y3)		Grade 3 (Y2) to Grade 4 (Y3)		Grade 3 (Y1) to Grade 3 (Y3)		Grade 4 (Y1) to Grade 4 (Y3)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
ITBS Comprehension NPR	15	29%	23	44%	26	50%	17	33%	24	46%
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	19	37%	16	31%	17	33%	20	38%	19	37%
ITBS Reading Total NPR	16	31%	24	46%	27	52%	18	35%	24	46%

Note: N reflects the number of schools meeting the performance benchmark.

Percent reflects the percentage of schools meeting the performance benchmark (based on 52 schools).

***Performance Benchmarks met used to determine school's performance benchmarking status for 2005-2006.

Greatest Gains

Schools that achieved at least 73% or more of their Performance Benchmarks and at least three of six ITBS year1 and year3 comparisons were identified has having made the greatest gains. In 2005-2006, seven schools participating in Iowa Reading First were identified as making the greatest gains (see Table 5).

Table 5. Iowa Reading First Schools that Made the Greatest Gains in 2005-2006.

SCHOOL	Number of Performance Benchmarks Met	Percent of Performance Benchmarks Met	Number of Greatest Gains Y1 to Y3 ITBS
New Market Elementary	39	97.50%	3
Sioux City - Everett Elementary	33	82.50%	6
Malvern - Chantry Elementary	34	85.00%	4
Sentral Elementary	34	85.00%	3
Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary	33	82.50%	3
Russell Elementary	32	80.00%	3
Ottumwa – James Elementary	29	72.50%	5

Successful Schools

This year, the Iowa Department of Education identified 14 schools that were successful at increasing the percentage of students proficient on various reading assessments. A school was identified as a "successful school" if it achieved 23 (76%) or more of the 30 successful school indicators with 75% of students proficient ***and/or*** was identified as having made the greatest gains in the 2005-2006 school year (see Table 6).

Table 6. Schools Identified as "Successful Schools."

SCHOOL
Albert City-Truesdale Elementary
Alden Elementary
Chariton-Columbus/Van Allen Elementary
Diagonal Elementary
Fremont Elementary
Malvern-Chantry Elementary
New Market Elementary
Ottumwa James Elementary
Russell Elementary
Sentral Elementary
Sigourney Elementary
Sioux City - Everett Elementary
Twin Rivers Elementary
Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary

Successful School Indicators. Analyses were conducted to determine the percentage of students proficient on 30 indicators of success by school. Specifically, a school was coded as having met an indicator of success if 75% or more of students were proficient for each grade and assessment (see Table 7). Twelve schools attained 23 (76%) or more of the 30 successful school indicators (see Table 8).

Table 7. Successful School Indicators.

PAT/BRI SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL INDICATORS WITHIN YEARS by TEST	2005-2006 (Year 3)			
	Grade			
	K	1	2	3
PAT Rhyming	X	X		
PAT Deletion	X	X		
PAT Blending	X	X		
PAT Segmentation		X		
PAT Isolation		X		
PAT Substitution		X		
PAT Graphemes		X		
PAT Decoding		X		
BRI Fluency			X	X
BRI Comprehension			X	X

PAT/BRI SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL INDICATORS MET ACROSS YEARS by TEST	2004-2005 (Year 2) to 2005-2006 (Year 3)		2003-2004 (Y1) to 2005-2006 (Yr 3)
	Grade		Grade
	Grade 1 (Y2) to Grade 1 (Y3)	Grade 2 (Y2) to Grade 2 (Y3)	Grade 1 (Y1) to Grade 1 (Y3)**
PAT Graphemes		X	
PAT Decoding		X	
BRI Fluency	X		X
BRI Comprehension	X		X

ITBS SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL INDICATORS MET ACROSS YEARS by TEST	2004-2005 (Year 2) to 2005-2006 (Year 3)		
	Grade		
	Grade 3 (Y2) to Grade 3 (Y3)	Grade 4 (Y2) to Grade 4 (Y3)	Grade 3 (Y2) to Grade 4 (Y3)**
ITBS Comprehension NPR	X	X	X
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	X	X	X
ITBS Reading Total NPR	X	X	X

Note: "X" reflects indicator used in analyses to determine "successful schools."

** Reflects cohort group data.

Table 8. Schools Attaining 23 (76%) or More of the 30 Successful School Indicators.

SCHOOL	Number of Indicators Met	Percentage of Indicators Met
Albert City-Truesdale Elementary	25	83%
Alden Elementary	23	77%
Chariton-Columbus/Van Allen Elementary	24	80%
Diagonal Elementary	28	93%
Fremont Elementary	23	77%
Malvern-Chantry Elementary	25	83%
New Market Elementary	29	97%
Russell Elementary	24	80%
Sentral Elementary	25	83%
Sigourney Elementary	24	80%
Twin Rivers Elementary	25	83%
Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary	24	80%

RESULTS OF YEAR 3 (2005-2006) STUDENT PERFORMANCE COMPARISONS

Student Performance Results (Fall, 2005 – Spring, 2006)

Students Scoring At Grade Level/Proficiency (All Students; see Table 9)

PAT Rhyming. In the fall, 64% of kindergarten students and 88% of first grade students were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 90% of kindergarten students and 92% of first grade students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 26% and 4% respectively.

PAT Deletion. In the fall, 50% of kindergarten students and 82% of first grade students were proficient in deletion. By spring, 79% of kindergarten students and 90% of first graders were proficient in deletion, an increase of 29% and 8% respectively.

PAT Blending. In the fall, 52% of kindergarten students and 84% of first grade students were proficient in blending. By spring, 85% of kindergarten students and 92% of first graders were proficient in blending, an increase of 33% and 8% respectively.

PAT Segmentation. In the fall, 86% of first grade students were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 97% of first graders were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 11%.

PAT Isolation. In the fall, 80% of first grade students were proficient in isolation. By spring, 95% of first graders were proficient in isolation, an increase of 15%.

PAT Substitution. In the fall, 78% of first grade students were proficient in substitution. By spring, 91% of first graders were proficient in substitution, an increase of 13%.

PAT Graphemes. In the fall, 70% of first grade students were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 93% of first graders were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 23%.

In the fall, 89% of second grade students were proficient in graphemes.

PAT Decoding. In the fall, 64% of first grade students were proficient in decoding. By spring, 88% of first graders were proficient in decoding, an increase of 24%.

In the fall, 84% of second grade students were proficient in decoding.

BRI Fluency. In the fall, 44% of second grade students and 41% of third grade students were proficient in fluency. By spring, 55% of second graders and 45% of third grade students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 11% and 4% respectively.

In the spring, 55% of first grade students were proficient in fluency.

BRI Comprehension. In the fall, 25% of second grade students and 52% of third grade students were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 59% of second graders and 77% of third grade students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 34% and 25% respectively.

In the spring, 59% of first grade students were proficient in comprehension.

ITBS Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 61% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 65% of the students were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 42% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 42% of the students were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 57% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 60% of the students were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 34% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 41% of the students were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 60% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 65% of the students were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 38% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 43% of the students were proficient in their reading skills.

Students Scoring at Grade Level by Gender (see Table 10)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 61% of male and 67% female students were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 89% of male and 92% of female students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 28% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 87% of male and 89% female students were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 91% of male and 93% of female students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 4% and 4% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten male and female students was 6% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. The females still scored higher than the males.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade male and female students was 2% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap remained constant at 2%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 50% of male and 51% female students were proficient in deletion. By spring, 76% of male and 82% of female students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 26% and 31% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 79% of male and 85% female students were proficient in deletion. By spring, 88% of male and 91% of female students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 9% and 6% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten male and female students was 1% (with females scoring higher). While both male and female students made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between male and female students proficient in deletion widened to 6%. Female students scored higher than the males.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade male and female students was 6% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 50% of male and 54% female students were proficient in blending. By spring, 83% of male and 87% of female students were proficient in blending, an increase of 33% and 33% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 82% of male and 86% female students were proficient in blending. By spring 91% of male and 93% of female students were proficient in blending, an increase of 9% and 7% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten male and female students was 4% (with females scoring higher). While both male and female students made progress in the spring, the achievement gap remained constant at 4%. Female students scored higher than the males.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between first grade male and female students was 4% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 2%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 84% of male and 88% female students were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 96% of male and 97% of female students were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 12% and 9% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade male and female students was 4% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 1%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 76% of male and 84% female students were proficient in isolation. By spring, 94% of male and 97% of female students were proficient in isolation, an increase of 18% and 13% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between first grade male and female students was 8% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 76% of male and 79% female students were proficient in substitution. By spring, 91% of male and 91% of female students were proficient in substitution, an increase of 15% and 12% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade male and female students was 3% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and there was a 0% achievement gap, as both males and females scored the same.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 66% of male and 74% female students were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 91% of male and 94% of female students were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 25% and 20% respectively.

Among second grade students, 86% of males and 92% of females were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between male and female first grade students was 8% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. The females still scored higher that the males. The achievement gap between male and second grade students was 6% (with females scoring higher than males) in graphemes.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between second grade male and female students was 6% (with females scoring higher than males).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 60% of male and 68% female students were proficient in decoding. By spring, 87% of male and 90% of female students were proficient in decoding, an increase of 27% and 22% respectively.

Among second grade students, 81% of males and 88% of females were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between male and female first grade students was 8% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. The females still scored higher that the males. The achievement gap between male and second grade students was 7% (with females scoring higher than males) in decoding.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between second grade male and female students was 7% (with females scoring higher than males).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 39% of male and 49% female students were proficient in fluency. By spring, 50% of male and 61% of female students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 11% and 12% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 37% of male and 45% female students were proficient in fluency. By spring, 40% of male and 50% of female students were proficient in fluency, a decrease of 3% and increase of 5% respectively.

Among first grade students, 51% of males and 61% of females were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade male and female students was 10% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 10% to 11% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade male and female students was 8% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 10% in the spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade male and female students was 10% (with females scoring higher than males).

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 24% of male and 26% female students were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 57% of male and 60% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 33% and 34% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 51% of male and 52% female students were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 77% of male and 77% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 26% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students, 56% of males and 61% of females were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade male and female students was 2% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 2% to 3% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between the third grade male and female students was 1% (with female students scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, and the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 0% in the spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade male and female students was 5% (with females scoring higher than males).

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 59% of males and 64% of females were proficient. Among fourth graders, 62% of males, and 68% of females were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 39% of males and 45% of females were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 39% of males and 45% of females were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade male students and female students was 5%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade male and female students was 6%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade male students and female students was 6%, and the achievement gap between fourth grade males and females was also 6%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 55% of males and 58% of females were proficient. Among fourth graders, 61% of males, and 59% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 33% of males and 36% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 41% of males and 41% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade male students and female students was 3% (with females scoring higher). At the fourth grade level, the achievement gap between male students and female students was only 2%, with male students scoring higher than female students.

At the third grade level, the achievement gap between male and female students in ITBS Vocabulary IPR was 3%, with females scoring higher. At the fourth grade level, male and female students scored the same and subsequently there was a 0% achievement gap between the two groups.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 58% of males and 62% of females were proficient. Among fourth graders, 63% of males, and 66% of females were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 36% of males and 41% of females were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 41% of males and 45% of females were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade male students and female students was 4%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade male and female students was 3%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade male students and female students was 5%, while the achievement gap between fourth grade males and females was 4%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

Students *With and Without* an Economic Disadvantage Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 11)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 58% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 74% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 88% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 94% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 30% and 20% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 84% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 94% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 89% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 97% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 5% and a decrease of 3% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 16% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 10% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 8%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher in the spring.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 45% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 58% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion. By spring, 75% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 87% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion, an increase of 30% and 29% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 77% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 89% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion. By spring, 87% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 95% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion, an increase of 10% and 6% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 13% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 12%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 12%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 8%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher in the spring.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 48% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 58% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in

blending. By spring, 83% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 90% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending, an increase of 35% and 32% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 81% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 90% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending. By spring, 90% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 96% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending, an increase of 9% and 6% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 10%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 7%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 9%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher in the spring.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 83% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 92% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 96% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 99% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 13% and 7% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 9%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 75% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 89% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in isolation. By spring, 94% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 97% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in isolation, an increase of 19% and 8% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 14%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 73% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 86% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in substitution. By spring, 89% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 96% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in substitution, an increase of 10% and 16% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 13%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the

achievement gap narrowed to 7%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 65% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 79% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 91% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 97% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 26% and 18% respectively.

Among second grade students, 85% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 95% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 14%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%. The students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher than those *with* an economic disadvantage.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between second grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 10% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 58% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 75% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in decoding. By spring, 85% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 94% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in decoding, an increase of 27% and 19% respectively.

Among second grade students, 79% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 93% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 17%. Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 9%. The students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher than those *with* an economic disadvantage.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between second grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 14% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 37% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 55% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency. By spring, 47% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 70% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency, an increase of 10% and 15% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 35% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 51% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency. By spring, 38% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 56% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency, an increase of 3% and 5% respectively.

Among first grade students, 48% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 70% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 18% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 18% to 23% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 16%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to18%. Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 22% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 18% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 36% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 52% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 69% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 34% and 33% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 46% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 60% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 74% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 81% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 28% and 21% respectively.

Among first grade students, 52% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 71% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 18% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, and the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 17% in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 14% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 7%. Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 19% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 54% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 73% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient. Among fourth graders, 57% of students *with* an economic disadvantage, and 77% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 33% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 56% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 33% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 55% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 19%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 20%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher than students *with* economic disadvantage in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 23%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 22%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher than students *with* economic disadvantage in both cases.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 47% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 72% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient. Among fourth graders, 48% of students *with* an economic disadvantage, and 77% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 24% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 50% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 29% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 59% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 25%. Similarly, the achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 29%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher than students *with* economic disadvantage in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between third grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 26%. Similarly, the achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* an economic disadvantage was 30%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher than students *with* economic disadvantage in both cases.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 50% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 74% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient. Among fourth graders, 55% of students *with* an economic disadvantage, and 80% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 28% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 55% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 32% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 60% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* economic disadvantage was 24%. The achievement gap in reading skills between fourth grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* economic disadvantage was 25%. Students *without* economic disadvantage scored higher than students *with* economic disadvantage in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* economic disadvantage was 27%. The achievement gap in reading skills between fourth grade students *with* economic disadvantage and those *without* economic disadvantage was smaller at 28%. Students *without* economic disadvantage scored higher than students *with* economic disadvantage in both cases.

Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level (see Tables 12a – 12d).

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 73% of White students and 39% of Hispanic students, 60% of Black/African-American students, 46% of Asian students and 50% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 94% of White students, 78% of Hispanic students, 90% of Black/African-American students, 89% of Asian students and 88% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 21%, 39%, 30%, 43%, and 38% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 91% of White students, 75% of Hispanic students, 88% of Black/African-American students, 91% of Asian students and 86% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 95% of White students, 82% of Hispanic students, 92% of Black/African-American students, 94% of Asian students and 87% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 4%, 7%, 4%, 3%, and 1% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 34% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 13% gap between White and Black students, a 27% gap between White and Asian students, and an 23% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. At the same time, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed

from 34% to 16%, for Black students from 13% to 4%, for Asian students from 27% to 5%, and for Native American students from 23% to 6% (White students continued to score higher).

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 3% gap between White and Black students, a 0% gap between White and Asian students, and a 5% gap between White and Native American students (with the exception of Asian students who had similar scores to Whites students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. While the achievement gap between White and Hispanic students narrowed from 16% to 13%, the achievement gap for Black students remained constant at 3%, and the achievement gap widened between White and Asian students from 0% to 1%, and for Native American students widened from 5% to 8%, respectively (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 58% of White students, 30% of Hispanic students, 44% of Black/African-American students, 41% of Asian students and 39% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion. By spring, 84% of White students and 64% of Hispanic, 74% of Black/African-American students, 83% of Asian students and 73% of Native Americans students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 26%, 34%, 30%, 42%, and 34% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 86% of White students, 69% of Hispanic students, 71% of Black/African-American students, 88% of Asian students and 86% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion. By spring, 93% of White students, 84% of Hispanic students, 79% of Black/African-American students, 96% of Asian students and 93% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion, an increase of 7%, 15%, 8%, 8%, and 7% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 28% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 14% gap between White and Black students, a 17% gap between White and Asian students, and a 19% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in deletion. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 28% to 20%, for Black students narrowed from 14% to 10%, for Asian students narrowed from 17% to 1%, and for Native American students narrowed from 19% to 11% (White students continued to score higher).

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 17% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 15% gap between White and Black students, a 2% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and 0% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups except Asian students). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in deletion. With the exception of Asian and Native American students, the achievement gap between White and other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 17% to 9%, for Black students narrowed from 15% to 14%, for Asian students widened from 2% to 3%, and the achievement gap for Native American students remained constant at 0% (Except for Asian

students and Native American students, White students continued to score higher than the other subgroups).

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 59% of White students, 38% of Hispanic students, 40% of Black/African-American students, 31% of Asian students and 45% of Native Americans were proficient in blending. By spring, 89% of White students, 79% of Hispanic students, 74% of Black/African-American students, 83% of Asian students and 83% of Native Americans were proficient in blending, an increase of 30%, 41%, 34%, 52%, and 38% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 88% of White students, 80% of Hispanic students, 71% of Black/African-American students, 88% of Asian students and 87% of Native Americans were proficient in blending. By spring, 94% of White students, 90% of Hispanic students, 81% of Black/African-American students, 94% of Asian students and 93% of Native Americans were proficient in blending, an increase of 6%, 10%, 10%, 6%, and 6% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 21% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 19% gap between White and Black students, a 28% gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in blending. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 21% to 10%, for Black students narrowed from 19% to 15%, for Asian students narrowed from 28% to 6%, and for Native American students narrowed from 14% to 6% (White students continued to score higher).

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was an 8% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 17% gap between White and Black students, a 0% gap between White and Asian students, and a 1% gap between White and Native American students. Except for Asian students who had similar scores to White students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups. By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in blending. With the exception of Asian and Native American students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. While the achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 8% to 4%, and for Black students narrowed from 17% to 13%, the gap remained constant for Asian students at 0%, and the gap also remained constant for Native American students at 1% (Except for Asian students who scored similar to White students, White students continued to score higher).

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 89% of White students, 78% of Hispanic students, 84% of Black/African-American students, 89% of Asian students and 76% of Native Americans were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 98% of White students, 93% of Hispanic students, 95% of Black/African-American students, 96% of Asian students and 95% of Native Americans were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 9%, 16%, 11%, 7%, and 19% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 11% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 5% gap between White and Black students, a 0% gap between White and Asian students and a 13% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than the other groups of students. By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in segmentation. Except for Asian students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 11% to 4%, for Black students narrowed from 5% to 3%, for Asian students widened from 0% to 2%, and for Native American students narrowed from 13% to 3% (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 85% of White students, 72% of Hispanic students, 66% of Black/African-American students, 88% of Asian students and 75% of Native Americans were proficient in isolation. By spring, 96% of White students, 96% of Hispanic students, 89% of Black/African-American students, 98% of Asian students and 95% of Native Americans were proficient in isolation, an increase of 11%, 24%, 23%, 10%, and 20% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 19% gap between White and Black students, a 3% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 10% gap between White and Native American students. Except for Asian students, White students scored higher than all other groups. By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in isolation. Except for Asian students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed for all groups. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 13% to 0%, for Black students narrowed from 19% to 7%, for Asian students narrowed from 3% to 2%, and for Native American students narrowed from 10% to 1%. (White students continued to score higher, with the exception of Asian students who scored higher than all the other subgroups).

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 83% of White students, 68% of Hispanic students, 63% of Black/African-American students, 79% of Asian students and 81% of Native Americans were proficient in substitution. By spring, 94% of White students, 89% of Hispanic students, 79% of Black/African-American students, 96% of Asian students and 97% of Native Americans were proficient in substitution, an increase of 11%, 21%, 16%, 17%, and 16% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 15% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 20% gap between White and Black students, a 4% gap between White and Asian students, and a 2% gap between White and Native American students (White students scored higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in substitution. At the same time, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 15% to 5%, for Black students narrowed from 20% to 15%, for Asian students narrowed from 4% to 2%, and for Native American students widened from 2% to 3% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups except Native American students).

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 73% of White students, 64% of Hispanic students, 65% of Black/African-American students, 93% of Asian students and 54% of Native Americans were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 94% of White students, 92% of Hispanic students, 83% of Black/African-American students, 100% of Asian students and 97% of Native Americans were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 21%, 28%, 18%, 7%, and 43% respectively.

Among second grade students, 92% of White students, 83% of Hispanic students, 80% of Black/African-American students, 86% of Asian students and 81% of Native Americans were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 9% gap between White and Hispanic students, an 8% gap between White and Black students, a 20% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 19% gap between White and Native American students (with the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in graphemes. With the exception of Black students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 9% to 2%, for Black students widened from 8% to 11%, for Asian students narrowed from 20% to 6%, and for Native American students narrowed from 19% to 3% (White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups except for Asian and Native American students).

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 9% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 12% gap between White and Black students, a 6% percent gap between White and Asian students, and an 11% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 67% of White students, 54% of Hispanic students, 54% of Black/African-American students, 82% of Asian students and 68% of Native Americans were proficient in decoding. By spring, 90% of White students, 86% of Hispanic students, 78% of Black/African-American students, 100% of Asian students and 92% of Native Americans were proficient in decoding, an increase of 23%, 32%, 24%, 18%, and 24% respectively.

Among second grade students, 89% of White students, 77% of Hispanic students, 69% of Black/African-American students, 90% of Asian students and 75% of Native Americans were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 13% gap between White and Black students, a 15% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 1% gap between White and Native American students (with Native American students scoring higher). With the exception of Asian and Native American students, White students scored higher than all the other students). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in decoding. With the exception of Native American students, the achievement gap between White and all other

subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 13% to 4%, for Black students narrowed from 13% to 12%, for Native American students widened from 1% to 2% and for Asian students narrowed from 15% to 10%. With the exception of Asian and Native American students, White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 12% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 20% gap between White and Black students, a 1% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students (with the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 48% of White students, 36% of Hispanic students, 32% of Black/African-American students, 64% of Asian students and 33% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By spring, 61% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 37% of Black/African-American students, 59% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 13%, 9%, 5%, a decrease of 5%, and an increase of 25% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 45% of White students, 34% of Hispanic students, 28% of Black/African-American students, 42% of Asian students and 47% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By spring, 49% of White students, 38% of Hispanic students, 30% of Black/African-American students, 53% of Asian students and 47% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 4%, 4%, 2%, 11%, and 0% respectively.

Among first grade students, 61% of White students, 48% of Hispanic students, 38% of Black/African-American students, 61% of Asian students and 38% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 12% gap between White and Hispanic students, 16% gap between White and Black students, a 16 percent gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 15% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Asian students, all groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency. By spring, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students widened from 12% to 16%, it also widened between White and Black students from 16% to 24%, the achievement gap narrowed for Asian students from 16% to 2%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 15% to 3% (White students scored higher than all the other groups in the spring).

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students varied by racial group. There was a 11% gap between White and Hispanic students, 17% gap between White and Black students, a 3% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 2% gap between White and Native American students (with Native American students scoring higher). All groups, except Native American students whose scores remained constant, widened the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the spring. By spring, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic remained constant at 11%, the achievement gap between White and Black students widened from 17% to 19%, it widened between White and Asian students from 3% to 4%, and

the gap between White and Native American students remained constant at 2%. With the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than all the other groups in the spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students varied by racial group. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 23% gap between White and Black students, a 0% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 23% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups except Asian students).

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 29% of White students, 14% of Hispanic students, 20% of Black/African-American students, 14% of Asian students and 15% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 64% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 50% of Black/African-American students, 57% of Asian students and 50% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 35%, 31%, 30%, 43%, and 35% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 58% of White students, 35% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 48% of Asian students and 51% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 82% of White students, 63% of Hispanic students, 70% of Black/African-American students, 73% of Asian students and 68% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 24%, 28%, 28%, 25%, and 17% respectively.

Among first grade students, 64% of White students, 48% of Hispanic students, 52% of Black/African-American students, 57% of Asian students and 33% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 15% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 9% gap between White and Black students, a 15 % percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students. While all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in comprehension in the spring, the achievement gap widened for some groups. In the spring, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students widened from 15% to 19%, and between White and Black students widened from 9% to14 %. For the other two groups, the achievement gap narrowed between White and Asian students from 15% to 7%, and the gap between White and Native American students remained constant at 14%. White students scored higher than all the other groups in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between third grade students varied by racial group. There was a 23% gap between White and Hispanic students, 16% gap between White and Black students, 10% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 7% gap between White and Native American students. All groups made substantial progress in the spring. By spring, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 23% to 19%, between White and Black students narrowed from 16% to 12%, between White and Asian students narrowed from 10% to 9%, but widened between White and Native American students from 7% to 14% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

In the spring, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade students varied by racial group. There was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 12% gap between White and Black students, a 7% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 31% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 67% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 60% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient. Among fourth graders, 70% of White students, 54% of Hispanic students, 50% of Black/African-American students, 62% of Asian students and 71% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 49% of White students, 28% of Hispanic students, 23% of Black/African-American students, 34% of Asian students and 44% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 47% of White students, 31% of Hispanic students, 30% of Black/African-American students, 40% of Asian students and 37% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 25% gap between White and Black students, a 7% gap between White and Asian students, and a 9% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 20% gap between White and Black students, an 8% gap between White and Asian students, and a 1% gap between White and Native American students (with Native American students scoring higher). With the exception of Native American students, White students scored higher than all the other groups.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 21% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 26% gap between White and Black students, 15% gap between White and Asian students, and 5% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 17% gap between White and Black students, a 7% gap between White and Asian students, and a 10% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 66% of White students, 40% of Hispanic students, 32% of Black/African-American students, 44% of Asian students and 53% of Native Americans were proficient. Among fourth graders, 68% of White students, 39% of Hispanic students, 38% of Black/African-American students, 53% of Asian students and 59% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 44% of White students, 13% of Hispanic students, 17% of Black/African-American

students, 21% of Asian students and 30% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 49% of White students, 20% of Hispanic students, 20% of Black/African-American students, 26% of Asian students and 41% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 26% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 34% gap between White and Black students, a 22% gap between White and Asian students, and a 13 % gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 29% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 30% gap between White and Black students, a 15% gap between White and Asian students, and a 9% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 31% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27% gap between White and Black students, 23% gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 29% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 29% gap between White and Black students, a 23% gap between White and Asian students, and an 8% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 67% of White students, 46% of Hispanic, 36% of Black/African-American students, 52% of Asian students and 56% of Native Americans were proficient. Among fourth graders, 71% of White students, 49% of Hispanic students, 45% of Black/African-American students, 66% of Asian students and 67% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 47% of White students, 20% of Hispanic students, 20% of Black/African-American students, 27% of Asian students and 40% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 50% of White students, 26% of Hispanic students, 25% of Black/African-American students, 32% of Asian students and 43% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 21% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 31% gap between White and Black students, a 15% gap between White and Asian students, and 11% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 22% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 26% gap between White and Black students, a 5% gap between White and Asian students, and a 4% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 27% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27% gap

between White and Black students, 20% gap between White and Asian students, and a 7% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 24% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 25% gap between White and Black students, 18% gap between White and Asian students, and a 7% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

Students *With and Without* Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level (See Table 13)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 47% of students *with* disabilities and 65% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 71% of students *with* disabilities and 92% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 24% and 27% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 70% of students *with* disabilities and 90% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 77% of students *with* disabilities and 94% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 7% and 4% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten students *with* and *without* disabilities was 18% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap widened to 21%. The students *without* disabilities still scored higher than those *with* disabilities.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 20% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 17%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher than those *with* disabilities.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 31% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion. By spring, 50% of students *with* disabilities and 81% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion, an increase of 19% and 30% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 63% of students *with* disabilities and 84% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion. By spring, 70% of students *with* disabilities and 92% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion, an increase of 7% and 8% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten students *with* and *without* disabilities was 20% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap widened to 31% between students *with* and *without* disabilities.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 21% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in the spring, the achievement gap widened to 22%.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 27% of students *with* disabilities and 53% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending. By spring, 63% of students *with* disabilities and 87% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending, an increase of 36% and 34% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 67% of students *with* disabilities and 86% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending. By spring, 73% of students *with* disabilities and 95% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending, an increase of 6% and 9% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten students *with* and *without* disabilities was 26% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap between the two groups narrowed to 24% in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 19% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in the spring, the achievement gap widened to 22%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 68% of students *with* disabilities and 88% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 85% of students *with* disabilities and 98% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 17% and 10% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 20% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 13%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 54% of students *with* disabilities and 83% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in isolation. By spring, 79% of students *with* disabilities and 97% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in isolation, an increase of 25% and 14% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 29% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 18%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 58% of students *with* disabilities and 80% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in substitution. By spring, 73% of students *with* disabilities and 94% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in substitution, an increase of 15% and 14% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 22% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students

made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 21%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 45% of students *with* disabilities and 73% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 73% of students *with* disabilities and 95% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 28% and 22% respectively.

Among second grade students, 62% of students *with* disabilities and 93% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 28% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 22%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher that those *with* disabilities.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 31% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 38% of students *with* disabilities and 67% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in decoding. By spring, 63% of students *with* disabilities and 92% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in decoding, an increase of 25% and 25% respectively.

Among second grade students, 53% of students *with* disabilities and 89% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 29% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in decoding in the spring, the achievement gap remained constant at 29%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher than those *with* disabilities.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 36% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 22% of students *with* disabilities and 47% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By spring, 22% of students *with* disabilities and 61% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, an increase of 0% and 14% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 14% of students *with* disabilities and 45% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By spring, 13% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, a decrease of 1% and an increase of 6% respectively.

Among first grade students, 28% of students *with* disabilities and 59% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 25% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 25% to 39% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 31% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 31% to 38% between fall and spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 31% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher).

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 9% of students *with* disabilities and 27% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 64% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 20% and 37% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 20% of students *with* disabilities and 57% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 46% of students *with* disabilities and 82% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 26% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 18% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 18% to 35% between fall and spring. This was due to students *without* disabilities scoring much higher than they did in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 37% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed from 37% to 36% between fall and spring.

In the spring, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 34% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher).

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 22% of students *with* disabilities and 68% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. Among fourth graders, 24% of students *with* disabilities, and 74% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 13% of students *with* disabilities and 47% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 9% of students *with* disabilities and 49% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 46%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 50%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 34%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 40%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities in both cases.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 26% of students *with* disabilities and 62% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. Among fourth graders, 25% of students *with* disabilities, and 67% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 11% of students *with* disabilities and 39% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 11% of students *with* disabilities and 47% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 36%. The achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 42%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 28%. The achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 36%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities in both cases.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 24% of students *with* disabilities and 66% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. Among fourth graders, 25% of students *with* disabilities, and 73% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 10% of students *with* disabilities and 44% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 9% of students *with* disabilities and 50% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 42%. The achievement gap in reading skills between fourth

grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 48%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without disabilities* was 34%. The achievement gap in reading skills between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 41%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities in both cases.

Students *With and Without* Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 14).

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 27% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 75% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 48% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 72% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 91% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 80% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 94% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 8% and 3% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the kindergarten students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 41%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 18%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 19%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 14%. In both fall and spring students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 22% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 54% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion. By spring, 62% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 82% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion, an increase of 40% and 28% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 67% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 84% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion. By spring, 83% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 91% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion, an increase of 16% and 7% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the kindergarten students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 32%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 20%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 17%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 8%. In both fall and spring students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 25% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 55% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending. By spring, 79% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 86% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending, an increase of 54% and 31% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 77% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 85% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending. By spring, 90% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending, an increase of 13% and 8% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the kindergarten students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 30%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 7%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 8%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 3%. In both fall and spring students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 77% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 88% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 93% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 97% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 16% and 9% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 11%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 4%. Students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency in both fall and spring.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 71% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 82% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in isolation. By spring, 95% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 95% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in isolation, an increase of 24% and 13% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 11%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 0%. Students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency in both fall and spring.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 67% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 80% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in substitution. By spring, 88% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 92% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in substitution, an increase of 21% and 12% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 13%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 4%. Students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency in both fall and spring.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 66% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 71% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 92% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 26% and 22% respectively.

Among second grade students, 83% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 90% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 5%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 1%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 7% (with students *with* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *without* limited English proficiency).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 56% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 65% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in decoding. By spring, 86% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 89% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in decoding, an increase of 30% and 24% respectively.

Among second grade students, 77% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 86% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 9%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 3%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 9% (with students *with* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *without* limited English proficiency).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 36% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 46% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency. By spring, 43% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 57% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 7% and 11% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 34% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 42% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency. By spring, 41% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 46% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 7% and 4% respectively.

Among first grade students, 49% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 57% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 10%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had widened to 14%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 8%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 5%. In both fall and spring students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the spring, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 8% (with students *with* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *without* limited English proficiency).

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 13% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 27% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 44% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 31% and 34% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 31% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 55% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 59% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 80% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 28% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students, 47% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 14%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 17%. In both fall and spring the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between the third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 24%. By spring, the

achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 21%. In both fall and spring students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In the spring, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 14% (with students *with* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *without* limited English proficiency).

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 63% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. Among fourth graders, 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 25% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 45% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 45% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 15%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 20%.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 20%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 21%.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 31% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. Among fourth graders, 32% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 64% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 10% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 38% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 13% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 45% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 30%. The achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 32%.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 28%. The achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 32%.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 41% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 63% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. Among fourth graders, 44% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 16% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 42% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 18% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 46% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 22%. The achievement gap in reading total between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 24%.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 26%. The achievement gap in reading total between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 28%.

Special Education Data by Grade (see Table 15)

Data was collected to assess the number of students receiving Special Education services, the number of students referred to pre-referral services, and the number of pre-referrals that resulted in an IEP for students.

Students currently receiving special education services. The percentage of students receiving special education services decreased for kindergarten students by 3% (11% received services in 2004-2005 compared to 8% in 2005-2006); decreased for 1st graders by 1% (12% received services in 2004-2005 compared to 11% in 2005-2006); increased for 2nd graders by 1% (14% received in 2004-2005 compared to 15% in 2005-2006); decreased for 3rd graders by 2% (17% received services in 2004-2005 compared to 15% in 2005-2006); and was constant for 4th graders (17% received services in 2004-2005 compared to 17% in 2005-2006).

Percentage of students referred for pre-referral services. Overall, the percentage of students referred for pre-referral services decreased by between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years. The percentage decreased by 1% for kindergarten students (4% were referred for pre-referral services in 2004-2005 compared to 3% in 2005-2006); decreased by 2% for 1st graders (6% were referred for pre-referral services in 2004-2005 compared to 4% in 2005-2006); decreased by 2% for 2nd graders (8% were referred for pre-referral services in 2004-2005; 6% in 2005-2006; a decrease of 2%); decreased by 3% for 3rd graders (7% were referred for pre-referral services in 2004-2005 compared to 4% in 2005-2006); and decreased by 2% for 4th graders (5% were referred for pre-referral services in 2004-2005 compared to 3% in 2005-2006.).

Percentage of students placed in special education services. With the exception of kindergarten students, the percentage of students placed in special education services decreased between 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. The percentage of students that had an IEP initiated and placed in special education services stayed constant for kindergarten students (1% were placed in special education services in 2004-2005 compared to 1% in 2005-2006). The percentage of students that had an IEP initiated and placed decreased by 2% for 1st graders (3% were placed in special education services in 2004-2005 compared to 1% in 2005-2006); a decrease of 1% for 2nd graders (3% were placed in special education services in 2004-2005 compared to 2% in 2005-2006), a decrease of 2% for 3rd graders (3% were placed in special education services in 2004-2005 compared to 1% in 2005-2006), and a decrease of 1% for 4th graders (2% were placed in special education services in 2004-2005 compared to 1% in 2005-2006).

RESULTS OF YEAR1 (FALL, 2003) TO YEAR3 (SPRING, 2006) STUDENT PERFORMANCE COMPARISONS (TREND)

Student Performance Results (Fall 2003 – Spring 2006)

Students Scoring At Grade Level/Proficiency (All Students; see Table 16)

PAT Rhyming. In Fall 2003, 55% of kindergarten students and 65% of first grade students were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 90% of kindergarten students and 92% of first grade students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 35% and 27% respectively.

PAT Deletion. In Fall 2003, 49% of kindergarten students and 56% of first grade students were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 79% of kindergarten students and 90% of first graders were proficient in deletion, an increase of 30% and 33% respectively.

PAT Blending. In Fall 2003, 46% of kindergarten students and 59% of first grade students were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 85% of kindergarten students and 92% of first graders were proficient in blending, an increase of 39% and33% respectively.

PAT Segmentation. In Fall 2003, 66% of first grade students were proficient in segmentation. By Spring 2006, 97% of first graders were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 11%.

PAT Isolation. In Fall 2003, 64% of first grade students were proficient in isolation. By Spring 2006, 95% of first graders were proficient in isolation, an increase of 32%.

PAT Substitution. In Fall 2003, 60% of first grade students were proficient in substitution. By Spring 2006, 91% of first graders were proficient in substitution, an increase of 31%.

PAT Graphemes. In Fall 2003, 60% of first grade students were proficient on graphemes. By Spring 2006, 93% of first graders were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 33%.

In Fall 2003, 69% of second grade students were proficient on graphemes. By Fall, 2005, 89% of second grade students were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 20%

PAT Decoding. In Fall 2003, 54% of first grade students were proficient on decoding. By Spring 2006, 88% of first graders were proficient on decoding, an increase of 34%.

In Fall 2003, 65% of second grade students were proficient on decoding. By Fall, 2005, 84% of second grade students were proficient on decoding, an increase of 19%.

BRI Fluency. In Fall 2003, 40% of second grade students and 37% of third grade students were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 55% of second graders and 45% of third grade students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 16% and 8% respectively.

In the Spring 2004, 39% of first grade students were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 55% of first grade students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 16%.

BRI Comprehension. In Fall 2003, 21% of second grade students and 37% of third grade students were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 59% of second graders and 77% of third grade students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 37% and 40% respectively.

In Spring, 2005, 21% of first grade students were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 59% of first grade students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 12%

ITBS Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that in Spring 2004, 37% of third grade students and 62% of fourth grade students were proficient in their comprehension skills. By Spring 2006, 61% of third grade students and 65% of fourth grade students were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 24% and 3% respectively

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that in Spring 2004, 37% of third grade students and 57% of fourth grade students were proficient in their vocabulary skills. By Spring 2006, 57% of third grade students and 60% of fourth grade students were proficient in their vocabulary skills, an increase of 20% and 3% respectively

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate in Spring 2004, 37% of third grade students and 61% of fourth grade students were proficient in their reading skills. By Spring 2006, 60% of third graders and 65% of fourth graders were proficient in reading skills, an increase of 23% and 4% respectively.

Students Scoring at Grade Level by Gender (see Table 17)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 54% of male and 56% female students were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 89% of male and 92% of female students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 35% and 36 respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 63% of male and 68% female students were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 91% of male and 93% of female students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 28% and 26% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten male and female students was 2% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap widened to 3%. Female students scored higher than the males.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade male and female students was 5% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 2%. Female students scored higher than the males.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 48% of male and 51% female students were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 76% of male and 82% of female students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 28% and 31% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 54% of male and 59% female students were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 88% of male and 91% of female students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 34% and 32% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten male and female students was 3% (with females scoring higher). While both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between male and female students proficient in deletion increased to 6%. Female students scored higher than the males.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade male and female students was 5% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 43% of male and 49% female students were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 83% of male and 87% of female students were proficient in blending, an increase of 40% and 38% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 55% of male and 65% female students were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006 91% of male and 93% of female students were proficient in blending, an increase of 36% and 28% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten male and female students was 6% (with females scoring higher). While both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap narrowed to 4%. Female students scored higher than the males.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between first grade male and female students was 10% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 2%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 63% of male and 69% female students were proficient in segmentation. By Spring 2006, 96% of male and 97% of female students were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 33% and 28% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade male and female students was 6% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 1%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 59% of male and 69% female students were proficient in isolation. By Spring 2006, 94% of male and 97% of female students were proficient in isolation, an increase of 35% and 28% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in isolation between first grade male and female students was 11% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 57% of male and 64% female students were proficient in substitution. By Spring 2006, 91% of male and 91% of female students were proficient in substitution, an increase of 34% and 27% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade male and female students was 7% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 0%, with both males and females scored the same.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 53% of male and 67% female students were proficient on graphemes. By Spring 2006, 91% of male and 94% of female students were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 38% and 29% respectively.

Among second grade students, 66% of males and 72% of females were proficient on graphemes in Fall 2003. By Fall, 2005, 86% of males and 92% of females were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 20% and 20% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between male and female first grade students was 14% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. The females still scored higher that the males.

The achievement gap between male and second grade students was 6% (with females scoring higher than males) on graphemes. Both male and female second grade students made progress in the Fall 2005, and the achievement gap remained constant at 6%. The females still scored higher that the males.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 49% of male and 60% female students were proficient on decoding. By Spring 2006, 87% of male and 90% of female students were proficient on decoding, an increase of 38% and 30% respectively.

Among second grade students, 63% of males and 67% of females were proficient on decoding in Fall 2003. By Fall, 2005, 81% of males and 88% of females were proficient on decoding, an increase of 18% and 21% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between male and female first grade students was 11% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 4%. The females still scored higher that the males.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on decoding between second grade male and female students was 4% (with females scoring higher than males). Both male and female students made progress in Fall, 2005, the achievement gap widened between males and females by 3% (to 7%) with females scoring higher than males.

BRI Fluency. Among first grade students, 34% of males and 45% of females were proficient in fluency in Spring 2004. By Spring 2006, 51% of males and 61% of females were proficient in fluency an increase of 17% and 15%.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 36% of male and 43% female students were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 50% of male and 61% of female students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 14% and 18% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 34% of male and 40% female students were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 40% of male and 50% of female students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 6% and increase of 10% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade male and female students was 11% (with female students scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed from 11% to 10% between Spring 2004 and Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade male and female students was 7% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 7% to 10% between Fall 2003 and Spring 2006 (with females scoring higher than males).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade male and female students was 7% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 10% in the Spring 2006 (with females scoring higher than males).

BRI Comprehension. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 43% of male and 50% female students were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 57% of male and 60% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 14% and 10% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 21% of male and 22% female students were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 57% of male and 60% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 36% and 38% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 45% of male and 47% female students were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 77% of male and 77% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 32% and 30% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade male and female students was 7% (with female students scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed from 7% to 5% between Spring 2004 and Spring 2006 (with females scoring higher than males).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade male and female students was 1% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 1% to 3% between fall and Spring 2006 (with females scoring higher).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in comprehension between the third grade male and female students was 2% (with female students scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, and the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 0% in the Spring 2006.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 56% males and 64% females were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 59% of male and 64% of female third graders were proficient, an increase of 3% among males and a 0% among females.

Among fourth grade students in Spring 2004, 59% males and 66% females were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 62% of male and 68% of female fourth graders were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 3% and 2% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade male students and female students was 8%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade male and females students narrowed from 8% to 5% (with females scoring higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between fourth grade male students and female students was 7%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade male and females students narrowed from 7% to 6% (with females scoring higher).

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 59% of males and 62% of females were proficient in vocabulary. By Spring 2006, 55% of males and 58% of females were proficient in vocabulary a decrease of 4% and 4% respectively.

Among fourth grader students in Spring 2004, 57% males and 56% females were proficient in vocabulary. By Spring 2006, 61% of males, and 59% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills, an increase of 4% and 3% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade male students and female students was 3%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade male and females students remained constant at 3% (with females scoring higher) on vocabulary.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between fourth grade male students and female students was 1%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade male and females students widened from 1% to 2% (with males scoring higher).

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 58% of males and 63% of females were proficient in vocabulary. By Spring 2006, 58% of males and 52% of females were proficient in vocabulary. The percentage of male students proficient in reading remained constant and the percentage of female students proficient decreased by 1%.

Among fourth grader students in Spring 2004, 60% males and 63% females were proficient in reading. By Spring 2006, 63% of males, and 66% of females were proficient in their reading skills, an increase of 3% and 3% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade male students and female students was 5%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade male and female students narrowed to 4% (with females scoring higher) on reading.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between fourth grade male students and female students was 3%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between fourth grade male and female students remained constant at 3% (with females scoring higher) on reading.

Students *With and Without* an Economic Disadvantage Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 18)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 46% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 66% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 88% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 94% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 42% and 28% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 59% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 73% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 89% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 97% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 30% and a decrease of 24% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 20% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 14% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 8%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher in the Spring 2006.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 42% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 59% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 75% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 87% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion, an increase of 33% and 28% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 50% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 64% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 87% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 95% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in deletion, an increase of 37% and 31% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 17% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 12%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 14% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 8%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher in the Spring 2006.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 40% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 53% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 83% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 90% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending, an increase of 43% and 36% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 54% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 67% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 90% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 96% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in blending, an increase of 36% and 29% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 13% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 7%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 13% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%. Students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher in the Spring 2006.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 61% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 72% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in segmentation. By Spring 2006, 96% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 99% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 35% and 27% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 11% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 56% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 74% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in isolation. By Spring 2006, 94% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 97% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in isolation, an increase of 38% and 23% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 18% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 55% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 67% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in substitution. By Spring 2006, 89% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 96% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in substitution, an increase of 34% and 29% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 12% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 7%, with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 55% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 67% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on graphemes. By Spring 2006, 91% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 97% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 36% and 30% respectively.

Among second grade students, 62% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 78% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on graphemes in Fall 2003. By Fall, 2005, 85% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 95% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 23% and 17% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* and an economic disadvantage was 12% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%. The students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher that those *with* an economic disadvantage.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between second grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 16%. Both students *with* an economic disadvantage and *without* an economic disadvantage made progress in Fall, 2005, and the achievement gap narrowed to 10% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher) on graphemes.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 49% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 61% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on decoding. By Spring 2006, 85% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 94% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on decoding, an increase of 36% and 33% respectively.

Among second grade students, 58% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 75% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on decoding in Fall 2003. By Fall, 2005, 79% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 93% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient on decoding, an increase of 21% and 18% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 12% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 9%. The students *without* an economic disadvantage scored higher that those *with* an economic disadvantage.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between second grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 17% (with students *without* an economic

disadvantage scoring higher). Both students *with* an economic disadvantage and *without* an economic disadvantage made progress in Fall, 2005, and the achievement gap narrowed to 14%

BRI Fluency. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 32% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 48% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 47% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 70% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency, an increase of 15% and 22% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 32% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 50% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 47% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 70% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency, an increase of 15% and 20% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 32% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 43% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 38% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 56% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in fluency, an increase of 6% and 13% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 16% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 16% to 23% between Spring 2004 and Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 18% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 18% to 23% between Fall 2003and Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 11% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 18%. Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the Spring 2006.

BRI Comprehension. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 39% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 55% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 52% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 71% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 13% and 16% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 15% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 30% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 52% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 69% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 37% and 39% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 41% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 53% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 74% of students *with* an economic disadvantage and 81% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 33% and 28% respectively.

In the Spring 2004, the achievement gap in comprehension between first grade students *with* and *without* an economic disadvantage was 16% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, and the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 19% in the Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 15% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, and the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 17% in the Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in comprehension between third grade students *without* an economic disadvantage and those *with* an economic disadvantage was 13% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher). By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 8%. Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the Spring 2006.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 52% students *with* an economic disadvantage and 70% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 54% of students *without* an economic disadvantage and 73% of students *with* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 2% and 3% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 52% students *with* an economic disadvantage and 72% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 57% of students *without* an economic disadvantage and 77% of students *with* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension, an increase 5% in each group.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 18% By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage widened from 18% to 19% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between fourth grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 20%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between fourth grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage remained constant at 20%

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 52% students *with* an economic disadvantage and 71%

of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 47% of students *without* an economic disadvantage and 72% of students *with* an economic disadvantage were proficient in vocabulary, a decrease of 5% and an increase of 1% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 44% students *with* an economic disadvantage and 68% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in vocabulary. By Spring 2006, 48% of students *without* an economic disadvantage and 77% of students *with* an economic disadvantage were proficient in vocabulary, an increase of 4% and 9% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 19% By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage widened from 19% to 25% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between fourth grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 22% By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between fourth grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage widened from 22% to 29% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 52% students *with* an economic disadvantage and 71% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in reading. By Spring 2006, 50% of students *without* an economic disadvantage and 74% of students *with* an economic disadvantage were proficient in reading, a decrease of 2% and an increase of 3% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 49% students *with* an economic disadvantage and 72% of students *without* an economic disadvantage were proficient in reading. By Spring 2006, 55% of students *without* an economic disadvantage and 80% of students *with* an economic disadvantage were proficient in reading, an increase of 6% and 8% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 19%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage widened from 19% to 24% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between fourth grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage was 23% By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between fourth grade students *with* an economic disadvantage and students *without* an economic disadvantage widened from 23% to 25% (with students *without* an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups Scoring at Grade Level (see Tables 19a – 19d)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 63% of White students and 29% of Hispanic students, 49% of Black/African-American students, 41% of Asian students and 40% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 94% of White students, 78% of Hispanic students, 90% of Black/African-American students, 89% of Asian students and 88% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 31%, 49%, 41%, 49%, and 29% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 69% of White students, 47% of Hispanic students, 69% of Black/African-American students, 69% of Asian students and 56% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 95% of White students, 82% of Hispanic students, 92% of Black/African-American students, 94% of Asian students and 87% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 26%, 35%, 23%, 26%, and 31% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 34% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 14% gap between White and Black students, a 22% gap between White and Asian students, and an 23% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. At the same time, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 34% to 16%, for Black students from 14% to 4%, for Asian students from 22% to 5%, but widened for Native American students from 23% to 25% (White students continued to score higher).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 22% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 0% gap between White and Black students, a 0% gap between White and Asian students, and a 13% gap between White and Native American students (with the exception of Asian and Black/African-American students who had similar scores to Whites students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. While the achievement gap between White and Hispanic students narrowed from 22% to 13%, the achievement gap widened between White and Black students from 0% to 3%; White and Asian students from 0% to 1%, and narrowed between White and Native American students widened from 13% to 8%, respectively (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 57% of White students, 24% of Hispanic students, 41% of Black/African-American students, 37% of Asian students and 44% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 84% of White students and 64% of Hispanic, 74% of Black/African-American students, 83% of Asian students and 73% of Native Americans students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 27%, 20%, 10%, 1%, and 11% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 61% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 49% of Black/African-American students, 41% of Asian students and 55% of Native Americans were

proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 93% of White students, 84% of Hispanic students, 79% of Black/African-American students, 96% of Asian students and 93% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion, an increase of 32%, 39%, 30%, 55%, and 39% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 33% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 16% gap between White and Black students, a 20% gap between White and Asian students, and a 13% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 33% to 20%, for Black students narrowed from 16% to 10%, for Asian students narrowed from 20% to 1%, and for Native American students narrowed from 13% to 11% (White students continued to score higher).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 39% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 30% gap between White and Black students, a 55% gap between White and Asian students, and 39% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 16% to 9%, for Black students widened from 12% to 14%, for Asian students narrowed from 20% to 3% (Asian students scored higher than White students), and the achievement gap for Native American students narrowed from 6% to 0%. Except for Asian students and Native American students, White students continued to score higher than the other subgroups.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 51% of White students, 33% of Hispanic students, 38% of Black/African-American students, 35% of Asian students and 39% of Native Americans were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 89% of White students, 79% of Hispanic students, 74% of Black/African-American students, 83% of Asian students and 83% of Native Americans were proficient in blending, an increase of 38%, 47%, 36%, 48%, and 45% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 63% of White students, 54% of Hispanic students, 51% of Black/African-American students, 10% of Asian students and 71% of Native Americans were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 94% of White students, 90% of Hispanic students, 81% of Black/African-American students, 94% of Asian students and 93% of Native Americans were proficient in blending, an increase of 32%, 37%, 30%, 54%, and 23% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 18% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 13% gap between White and Black students, a 16% gap between White and Asian students, and a 12% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in blending. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 18% to 10%, for Black students widened from 13% to 15%, for Asian students narrowed from 16% to 6%, and

for Native American students narrowed from 12% to 6% (White students continued to score higher).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was an 9% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 12% gap between White and Black students, a 53% gap between White and Asian students, and a 8% gap between White and Native American students. Except for Asian students who had higher scores than the White students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups. By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in blending. With the exception of Asian and Native American students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. While the achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 9% to 4%, widened for Black/African-American students from 12% to 13%, narrowed for Asian students to 0%, and narrowed for Native American students to 1% (Except for Asian students who scored similar to White students, White students continued to score higher).

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 69% of White students, 55% of Hispanic students, 61% of Black/African-American students, 71% of Asian students and 69% of Native Americans were proficient in segmentation. By Spring 2006, 98% of White students, 93% of Hispanic students, 95% of Black/African-American students, 96% of Asian students and 95% of Native Americans were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 29%, 39%, 34%, 25%, and 26% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in segmentation between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 14% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 8% gap between White and Black students, a 2% gap between White and Asian students and a 0% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Asian and Native American students, White students scored higher than the other groups of students. By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. Except for Asian and Native American students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 14% to 4%, for Black students narrowed from 8% to 3%, for Asian students the gap remained the same from 2% to 2%, and for Native American students widened from 0% to 3% (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 69% of White students, 54% of Hispanic students, 53% of Black/African-American students, 36% of Asian students and 64% of Native Americans were proficient in isolation. By Spring 2006, 96% of White students, 96% of Hispanic students, 89% of Black/African-American students, 98% of Asian students and 95% of Native Americans were proficient in isolation, an increase of 28%, 42%, 35%, 52%, and 31% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in isolation between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 15% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 16% gap between White and Black students, a 33% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 5% gap between White and Native American students. Except for Asian students, White students scored higher than all other groups. By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. The

achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed for all groups. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 15% to 0%, for Black students narrowed from 16% to 7%, for Asian students narrowed from 33% to 2%, and for Native American students narrowed from 5% to 1%. (White students continued to score higher, with the exception of Asian students who scored higher than all the other subgroups).

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 66% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 52% of Black/African-American students, 34% of Asian students and 44% of Native Americans were proficient in substitution. By Spring 2006, 94% of White students, 89% of Hispanic students, 79% of Black/African-American students, 96% of Asian students and 97% of Native Americans were proficient in substitution, an increase of 28%, 37%, 27%, 62%, and 53% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in substitution between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 15% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 14% gap between White and Black students, a 32% gap between White and Asian students, and a 22% gap between White and Native American students (White students scored higher than all the other subgroups). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 15% to 5%, for Black students widened from 14% to 15%, for Asian students narrowed from 32% to 2%, and for Native American students narrowed from 22% to 3% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups except Native American and Asian students).

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 63% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 56% of Black/African-American students, 56% of Asian students and 64% of Native Americans were proficient on graphemes. By Spring 2006, 94% of White students, 92% of Hispanic students, 83% of Black/African-American students, 100% of Asian students and 97% of Native Americans were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 32%, 41%, 28%, 44%, and 33% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 71% of White students, 67% of Hispanic students, 56% of Black/African-American students, 71% of Asian students and 84% of Native Americans were proficient on graphemes. By Fall 2005, 92% of White students, 83% of Hispanic students, 80% of Black/African-American students, 86% of Asian students and 81% of Native Americans were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 21%, 17%, 24%, 15%, and a decrease of 3% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on graphemes between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 12% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 7% gap between White and Black students, a 7% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 1% gap between White and Native American students (with Native American students scoring higher). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in graphemes. With the exception of Black students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 12% to 2%, for Black students widened from 7% to 11%, for Asian students narrowed from 7% to 6%, and for Native American students widened from 1% to 3% (White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups except for Asian and Native American students).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on graphemes between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 17% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 15% gap between White and Black students, a 0% percent gap between White and Asian students, and an 13% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

By Fall 2005, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in graphemes. With the exception of Hispanic and Asian students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students widened from 4% to 9%, for Black students narrowed from 15% to 12%, for Asian students widened from 0% to 6%, and for Native American students narrowed from 13% to 11% (White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups except for Asian and Native American students).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 57% of White students, 48% of Hispanic students, 49% of Black/African-American students, 47% of Asian students and 55% of Native Americans were proficient on decoding. By Spring 2006, 90% of White students, 86% of Hispanic students, 78% of Black/African-American students, 100% of Asian students and 92% of Native Americans were proficient on decoding, an increase of 33%, 37%, 30%, 53%, and 37% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 67% of White students, 64% of Hispanic students, 49% of Black/African-American students, 71% of Asian students and 72% of Native Americans were proficient on decoding. By Fall 2005, 89% of White students, 77% of Hispanic students, 69% of Black/African-American students, 90% of Asian students and 75% of Native Americans were proficient on decoding, an increase of 22%, 12%, 20%, 19%, and 3% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on decoding between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 9% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 8% gap between White and Black students, a 10% gap between White and Asian students, and a 2% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other students). By Spring 2006, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in decoding. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 9% to 4%, for Black students widened from 8% to 12%, for Asian students remained constant at 10%, and for Native American students the gap remained constant at 2%. With the exception of Asian and Native American students, White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on decoding between the different second grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 3% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 18% gap between White and Black students, a 4% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 5% gap between White and Native American students (with Native American students scoring higher). With the exception of Asian and Native American students, White students scored higher than all the other students). By Fall 2005, all groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in decoding. The achievement gap for Hispanic students widened from 3% to 12%, for Black students widened from 18% to 20%, for Asian students narrowed from 4% to 1%, and for Native American students the gap

widened from 5% to 14%. With the exception of Asian students, White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups.

BRI Fluency. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 44% of White students, 27% of Hispanic students, 28% of Black/African-American students, 48% of Asian students and 29% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 61% of White students, 48% of Hispanic students, 38% of Black/African-American students, 61% of Asian students and 38% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 17%, 21%, 10%, a decrease of 13%, and an increase of 9% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 43% of White students, 27% of Hispanic students, 31% of Black/African-American students, 57% of Asian students and 37% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 61% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 37% of Black/African-American students, 59% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 17%, 18%, 6%, 2%, and 20% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 40% of White students, 27% of Hispanic students, 28% of Black/African-American students, 45% of Asian students and 38% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 49% of White students, 38% of Hispanic students, 30% of Black/African-American students, 53% of Asian students and 47% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 9%, 11%, 2%, 8%, and 8% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students varied by racial group. There was a 17% gap between White and Hispanic students, 16% gap between White and Black students, a 4% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 15% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Asian students, all groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 17% to 13%, widened between White and Black students from 16% to 23%, the achievement gap narrowed for Asian students from 4% to 0%, and widened between White and Native American students from 15% to 23% (White students scored higher than all the other groups in the Spring 2006).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, 12% gap between White and Black students, a 14% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 6% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Asian students, all groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students remained constant at 16%, widened between White and Black students from 12% to 24%, the achievement gap narrowed for Asian students from 14% to 2%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 6% to 3% (White students scored higher than all the other groups in the Spring 2006).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students varied by racial group. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, 12% gap between White and Black students, a 5% percent gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 2% gap between White and Native American students. By Spring 2006, the

achievement gap between White and Hispanic students narrowed from13% to 11%, the achievement gap between White and Black students widened from 12% to 19%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 5% to 4%, and the gap between White and Native American students remained constant at 2%. With the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than all the other groups in the Spring 2006.

BRI Comprehension. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 52% of White students, 29% of Hispanic students, 39% of Black/African-American students, 49% of Asian students and 27% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 64% of White students, 48% of Hispanic students, 52% of Black/African-American students, 57% of Asian students and 33% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 12%, 19%, 13%, 8%, and 6% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 26% of White students, 9% of Hispanic students, 11% of Black/African-American students, 15% of Asian students and 19% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 64% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 50% of Black/African-American students, 57% of Asian students and 50% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 38%, 36%, 39%, 42%, and 31% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 52% of White students, 28% of Hispanic students, 40% of Black/African-American students, 27% of Asian students and 3% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 82% of White students, 63% of Hispanic students, 70% of Black/African-American students, 73% of Asian students and 68% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 29%, 35%, 31%, 46%, and 35% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between first grade students varied by racial group. There was a 23% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 13% gap between White and Black students, a 3% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 25% gap between White and Native American students. In the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 23% to 16%, narrowed between White and Black students from 13% to 12 %, widened between White and Asian students from 3% to 7%, and widened between White and Native American students from 25% to 31%. White students scored higher than all the other groups in the Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 17% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 15% gap between White and Black students, a 11% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 7% gap between White and Native American students. In the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students widened from 17% to 19%, narrowed between White and Black students from 15% to14 %. narrowed between White and Asian students from 11% to 7%, and widened between White and Native American students from 7% to 14%. White students scored higher than all the other groups in the Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between third grade students varied by racial group. There was a 24% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 12% gap between White and Black students, a 25% percent gap between White and Asian students, and a 19% gap between White and Native American students. All groups made substantial progress in the

Spring 2006. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 24% to 19%, between White and Black students remained constant at 12%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 25% to 9%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 19% to 14% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate in Spring 2004, among third graders, 66% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 46% of Black/African-American students, 50% of Asian students and 44% of Native Americans were proficient. By Spring 2006, among third graders, 67% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 60% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 1%, 5%, a decrease of 3%, an increase of 10%, and 14% respectively.

In Spring 2004, among fourth graders, 69% of White students, 45% of Hispanic students, 48% of Black/African-American students, 58% of Asian students and 59% of Native Americans were proficient. By Spring 2006, among fourth grade students, 70% of White students, 54% of Hispanic students, 50% of Black/African-American students, 62% of Asian students and 71% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 1%, 10%, 2%, 4%, and 12% respectively.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between the different racial groups varied. In Spring 2004, among third graders, there was a 21% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 20% gap between White and Black students, a 16% gap between White and Asian students, and a 22% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 21% to 16%, widened between White and Black from 20% to 25%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 16% to 7%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 22% to 9% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

In Spring 2004, among fourth graders, there was a 24% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 21% gap between White and Black students, a 11% gap between White and Asian students, and a 10% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 24% to 16%, narrowed between White and Black students from 21% to 20%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 11% to 8%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 10% to 1% (with the exception of Native American students, White students scored higher than the other subgroups).

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate in Spring 2004, among third graders, 69% of White students, 36% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 41% of Asian students and 46% of Native Americans were proficient. By Spring 2006, among third graders, 66% of White students, 40% of Hispanic students, 32% of Black/African-American students, 44% of Asian students and 53% of Native Americans were proficient, a decrease of 4%, an increase of 4%, a decrease of 9%, an increase of 3%, and 7% respectively.

In Spring 2004, among fourth graders, 66% of White students, 29% of Hispanic students, 37% of Black/African-American students, 39% of Asian students and 52% of Native Americans were proficient. By Spring 2006, among fourth grade students, 68% of White students, 39% of Hispanic students, 38% of Black/African-American students, 53% of Asian students and 59% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills, an increase of 1%, 10%, 1%, 14%, and 6% respectively.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between the different racial groups varied. In Spring 2004, among third graders, there was a 33% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27% gap between White and Black students, a 28% gap between White and Asian students, and a 23% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 33% to 26%, widened between White and Black from 27% to 34%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 28% to 22%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 23% to 13% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

In Spring 2004, among fourth graders, there was a 37% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 29% gap between White and Black students, a 27% gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 37% to 29%, widened between White and Black students from 29% to 30%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 27% to 15%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 14% to 9% (With the exception of Native American students, White students scored higher than all the other subgroups).

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate in Spring 2004, among third graders, 69% of White students, 39% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 45% of Asian students and 46% of Native Americans were proficient. By Spring 2006, among third graders, 67% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 60% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient, a decrease of 1%, an increase of 7%, a decrease of 6%, an increase of 6%, and 10% respectively.

In Spring 2004, among fourth graders, 69% of White students, 38% of Hispanic students, 44% of Black/African-American students, 50% of Asian students and 59% of Native Americans were proficient. By Spring 2006, among fourth grade students, 71% of White students, 49% of Hispanic students, 45% of Black/African-American students, 66% of Asian students and 67% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills, an increase of 2%, 12%, 1%, 16%, and 8% respectively.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between the different racial groups varied. In Spring 2004, among third graders, there was a 30% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27% gap between White and Black students, a 24% gap between White and Asian students, and a 23% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 30% to 21%, widened between White and Black from 27% to 31%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 24% to 15%, and narrowed between White

and Native American students from 23% to 11% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

In Spring 2004, among fourth graders, there was a 31% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 25% gap between White and Black students, a 19% gap between White and Asian students, and a 10% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 31% to 22%, widened between White and Black students from 25% to 26%, narrowed between White and Asian students from 19% to 5%, and narrowed between White and Native American students from 10% to 4% (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups).

Students *With and Without* Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 20)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 26% of students *with* disabilities and 58% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 71% of students *with* disabilities and 92% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 45% and 34% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 38% of students *with* disabilities and 68% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 77% of students *with* disabilities and 94% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 39% and 26% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten students *with* and *without* disabilities was 32% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap narrowed to 21%. The students *without* disabilities still scored higher than those *with* disabilities.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 30% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 17%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher than those *with* disabilities.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 30% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 50% of students *with* disabilities and 81% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion, an increase of 20% and 30% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 22% of students *with* disabilities and 60% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 70% of students *with* disabilities and 92% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion, an increase of 48% and 32% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten students *with* and *without* disabilities was 21% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap widened to 31% between students *with* and *without* disabilities.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 38% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap narrowed to 22%.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 24% of students *with* disabilities and 48% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 63% of students *with* disabilities and 87% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending, an increase of 39% among both groups.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 25% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 73% of students *with* disabilities and 95% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending, an increase of 48% and 32% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten students *with* and *without* disabilities was 24% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, but the achievement gap between the two groups remained constant at 24%.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 38% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap narrowed to 22%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 34% of students *with* disabilities and 69% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in segmentation. By Spring 2006, 85% of students *with* disabilities and 98% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 51% and 29% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 35% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 13%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 24% of students *with* disabilities and 68% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in isolation. By Spring 2006, 79% of students *with* disabilities and 97% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in isolation, an increase of 55% and 29% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in isolation between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 44% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 18%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 39% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in substitution. By Spring 2006, 73% of

students *with* disabilities and 94% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in substitution, an increase of 34% and 31% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 24% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 21%. Students *without* disabilities scored higher than students *with* disabilities.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 25% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on graphemes. By Spring 2006, 73% of students *with* disabilities and 95% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 48% and 32% respectively.

Among second grade students, 32% of students *with* disabilities and 74% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on graphemes in Fall 2003. Among second grade students, 62% of students *with* disabilities and 93% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on graphemes in Fall, 2005, an increase of 30% and 19% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 38% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap narrowed to 22%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher that those *with* disabilities.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on graphemes between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 42% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the Fall 2005, and the achievement gap narrowed to 31%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher that those *with* disabilities.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 21% of students *with* disabilities and 58% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on decoding. By Spring 2006, 63% of students *with* disabilities and 92% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on decoding, an increase of 42% and 34% respectively.

Among second grade students, 25% of students *with* disabilities and 71% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on decoding in Fall 2003. Among second grade students, 53% of students *with* disabilities and 89% of students *without* disabilities were proficient on decoding in Fall, 2005, an increase of 28% and 18% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 37% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient on decoding in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap narrowed to 29%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher that those *with* disabilities.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on decoding between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 46% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient on decoding in the Fall 2005, the achievement gap narrowed to 36%. The students *without* disabilities scored higher that those *with* disabilities.

BRI Fluency. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 14% of students *with* disabilities and 42% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 28% of students *with* disabilities and 59% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, an increase of 14% and 17% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 10% of students *with* disabilities and 44% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 22% of students *with* disabilities and 61% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, an increase of 12% and 17% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 10% of students *with* disabilities and 41% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 13% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, a decrease of 3% and an increase of 10% respectively.

In Spring, 2004 the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 28% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 28% to 31% between Spring 2004 and Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 34% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 34% to 39% between fall and Spring 2006.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 31% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 31% to 38% between fall and Spring 2006.

BRI Comprehension. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 18% of students *with* disabilities and 49% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 11% and 14% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 6% of students *with* disabilities and 23% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 64% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 23% and 41% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 15% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 46% of students *with* disabilities and 82% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 31% for both groups.

In Spring, 2004, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 31% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with*

and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 31% to 34% between Spring 2004 and Spring 2006. This was due to students *without* disabilities scoring much higher than they did in Spring 2004.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 17% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). While both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 17% to 35% between fall and Spring 2006. This was due to students *without* disabilities scoring much higher than they did in Fall 2003.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* and *without* disabilities was 36% (with students *without* disabilities scoring higher). Both students *with* and *without* disabilities made progress in the Spring 2006, and the achievement gap between these two groups remained constant.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 21% of students *with* disabilities and 66% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 22% of students *with* disabilities and 68% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 1% and 2% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 20% of students *with* disabilities and 70% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, among fourth graders, 24% of students *with* disabilities, and 74% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 4% for both groups of students.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 45%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities widened from 45% to 46% (students *without* disabilities scored higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 50%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities remained constant at 50% (students *without* disabilities scored higher).

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders in Spring 2004, 33% of students *with* disabilities and 65% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in vocabulary. By Spring 2006, 26% of students *with* disabilities and 62% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills, a decrease of 7% and 3% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 23% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in vocabulary. By Spring 2006, 25% of students *with* disabilities and 67% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills, an increase of 2% and 4% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 32%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities widened from 32% to 36% (students *without* disabilities scored higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 40%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities widened from 40% to 42% (students *without* disabilities scored higher).

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 24% of students *with* disabilities and 66% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. By Spring 2006, 24% of students *with* disabilities, and 66% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 18% of students *with* disabilities and 69% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in reading. By Spring 2006, 25% of students *with* disabilities and 67% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills, an increase of 7% and 4% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 42%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities stayed constant at 42%.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between fourth grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities was 51%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* disabilities and those *without* disabilities narrowed from 51% to 48% (students *without* disabilities scored higher).

Students *With and Without* Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 21)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 59% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 75% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 51% and 34% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 39% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming. By Spring 2006, 80% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 94% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 41% and 26% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between the kindergarten students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 35%. By Spring 2006, the

achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 18%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in rhyming between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 29%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 14%. In both fall and Spring 2006 students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 18% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 54% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 62% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 82% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion, an increase of 44% and 28% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 35% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 59% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion. By Spring 2006, 83% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 91% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion, an increase of 48% and 32% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between the kindergarten students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 36%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 20%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in deletion between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 24%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 8%. In both fall and Spring 2006 students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in Fall 2003, 26% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 49% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 79% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 86% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending, an increase of 53% and 38% respectively.

Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 42% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending. By Spring 2006, 90% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending, an increase of 47% and 31% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between the kindergarten students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 23%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 7%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the

students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in blending between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 19%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 3%. In both fall and Spring 2006 students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in segmentation. By Spring 2006, 93% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 97% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 45% and 30% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in segmentation between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 20%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 4%. Students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency in both Fall 2003 and Spring 2006.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 42% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 66% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in isolation. By Spring 2006, 95% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 95% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in isolation, an increase of 52% and 30% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in isolation between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 24%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 0%. Students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency in both fall and Spring 2006.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 37% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 63% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in substitution. By Spring 2006, 88% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 92% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in substitution, an increase of 51% and 29% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in substitution between the first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 26%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 4%. Students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency in both fall and Spring 2006.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 46% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on graphemes. By Spring 2006, 92% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of

students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 46% and 32% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 65% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 70% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on graphemes. By Fall, 2005 83% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 90% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on graphemes, an increase of 18% and 20% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on graphemes between first students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 15%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 1%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on graphemes between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 5% (with students *with* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *without* limited English proficiency). By Fall 2005, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 2%. In both Fall 2003 and Fall 2005 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in Fall 2003, 40% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 56% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on decoding. By Spring 2006, 86% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 89% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on decoding, an increase of 47% and 33% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 63% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 65% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on decoding. By Fall, 2005 77% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 86% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient on decoding, an increase of 15% and 20% respectively.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on decoding between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 16%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 3%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *with* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *without* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap on decoding between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 2%. By Fall 2005, the achievement gap between these two groups had widened to 9%. In both Fall 2003 and Fall 2005 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

BRI Fluency. Among first grade students, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 41% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency in the Spring 2004. By Spring, 2004, 49% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 57% of students

without limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 25% and 16% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 42% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 43% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 57% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 18% and 16% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 25% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 38% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency. By Spring 2006, 41% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 46% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 16% and 7% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in fluency between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 17%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 8%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 18%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 14%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 13%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 5%. In both Fall 2003 and Spring 2006 students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

BRI Comprehension. Among first grade students in Spring 2004, 29% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 48% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. Among first grade students, 47% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension in the Spring 2006, an increase of 18% and 13% respectively.

Among second grade students in Fall 2003, 8% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 23% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 44% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 36% and 38% respectively.

Among third grade students in Fall 2003, 22% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 49% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, 59% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 80% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 38% and 31% respectively.

In the Spring 2004, the achievement gap on comprehension between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 19% (with students *with* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *without* limited English proficiency). By Spring 2006, the achievement gap on comprehension between first grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency narrowed to 14% (with students *without* limited English proficiency scoring higher than students *with* limited English proficiency).

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 15%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 17%. In both fall and Spring 2006 the students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

In Fall 2003, the achievement gap in comprehension between the third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 27%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 21%. In both fall and Spring 2006 students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher than students *with* limited English proficiency.

ITBS Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) in Spring 2004 indicate that among third graders, 39% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 62% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. By Spring 2006 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 63% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 10% and 1% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 40% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 65% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By Spring 2006, among fourth graders, 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills, an increase of 9% and 2% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 23%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency narrowed from 23% to 15% (students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between fourth grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 25%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* disabilities narrowed from 25% to 20% (students *without* disabilities scored higher).

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) in Spring 2004 indicate that among third graders, 28% of students *with* limited English proficiency

and 64% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. By Spring 2006, 31% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient an increase of 3% and a decrease of 3% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 21% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills. By Spring 2006, 32% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 64% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills an increase of 11% and 3% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 36%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency narrowed from 36% to 30% (students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between fourth grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency was 40%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between fourth grade students *with* limited English proficiency and those *without* limited English proficiency narrowed from 40% to 32% (students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher).

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) in Spring 2004 indicate that among third graders, 34% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 64% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in reading. By Spring 2006, 41% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 63% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in reading, an increase of 7% and a decrease of 1% respectively.

Among fourth graders in Spring 2004, 29% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 65% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills. By Spring 2006, 44% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills, an increase of 14% and 3% respectively.

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 30%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency narrowed from 30% to 22% (students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher).

In Spring 2004, the achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between fourth grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency was 36%. By Spring 2006, the achievement gap between third grade students *with* and *without* limited English proficiency narrowed from 36% to 24% (students *without* limited English proficiency scored higher).

Tables

The following tables indicate the number ("N"), total, and percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency in Fall, 2005 and Spring, 2006. The tables also indicate the achievement gap between the comparison groups (e.g., male/female students, students *with/without* economic disadvantage) in Fall, 2005 and Spring, 2006, the change in the achievement gap (between fall and spring) and the direction of the change (e.g, narrowed, widened, no change).

Table 9. Number of Students Proficient in Reading (All Students)

		FALL 2005			SPRING 2006			
		ALL STUDENTS			All Students			
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof.	% Change in Prof
PAT Rhyming	K	1419	2222	64%	1976	2194	90%	26%
PAT Deletion	K	1116	2222	50%	1731	2194	79%	29%
PAT Blending	K	1150	2222	52%	1868	2194	85%	33%
PAT Rhyming	1	1959	2230	88%	2038	2213	92%	4%
PAT Deletion	1	1819	2230	82%	1985	2213	90%	8%
PAT Blending	1	1879	2230	84%	2040	2213	92%	8%
PAT Segmentation	1	1917	2230	86%	2139	2213	97%	11%
PAT Isolation	1	1785	2230	80%	2109	2213	95%	15%
PAT Substitution	1	1731	2230	78%	2024	2213	91%	14%
PAT Graphemes	1	1563	2231	70%	2055	2214	93%	23%
PAT Decoding	1	1422	2231	64%	1958	2214	88%	25%
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1				1221	2201	55%	55%
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1				1293	2201	59%	59%
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1916	2161	89%				
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1826	2161	84%				
BRI Fluency	2	965	2182	44%	1184	2138	55%	11%
BRI Comprehension	2	545	2182	25%	1251	2138	59%	34%
BRI Fluency	3	892	2176	41%	972	2166	45%	4%
BRI Comprehension	3	1122	2176	52%	1660	2166	77%	25%
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3				1311	2150	61%	
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3				1220	2150	57%	
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3				1280	2150	60%	
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3				904	2150	42%	
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3				738	2150	34%	
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3				827	2150	38%	
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4				1342	2059	65%	
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4				1231	2059	60%	
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4				1332	2059	65%	
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4				865	2059	42%	
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4				842	2059	41%	
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4				884	2059	43%	

Disaggregation of Students by Demographics*:* The following tables report the number of students who were proficient for each "risk" category and racial/ethnic group in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2006.

Table 10. Results for Students by Gender

		FALL 2005							SPRING 2006								
		Male Students			Female Students			Fall	Male Students			Female Students			Spring	% Change in	Direction of
	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	Ach Gap*	N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof.	Ach Gap*	Ach Gap	Change in Ach Gap
PAT Rhyming	K	680	1119	61%	739	1103	67%	6%	962	1087	89%	1014	1107	92%	3%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	558	1119	50%	558	1103	51%	1%	826	1087	76%	905	1107	82%	6%	-5%	Widened
PAT Blending	K	554	1119	50%	596	1103	54%	5%	903	1087	83%	965	1107	87%	4%	0%	No Change
PAT Rhyming	1	994	1146	87%	965	1084	89%	2%	1036	1137	91%	1002	1076	93%	2%	0%	No Change
PAT Deletion	1	902	1146	79%	917	1084	85%	6%	1003	1137	88%	982	1076	91%	3%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	944	1146	82%	935	1084	86%	4%	1035	1137	91%	1005	1076	93%	2%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	960	1146	84%	957	1084	88%	5%	1095	1137	96%	1044	1076	97%	1%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	874	1146	76%	911	1084	84%	8%	1065	1137	94%	1044	1076	97%	3%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	875	1146	76%	856	1084	79%	3%	1040	1137	91%	984	1076	91%	0%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	760	1146	66%	803	1085	74%	8%	1040	1138	91%	1015	1076	94%	3%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	683	1146	60%	739	1085	68%	9%	985	1138	87%	973	1076	90%	4%	5%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1								572	1130	51%	649	1071	61%	10%		
BRI Comprehension	1								637	1130	56%	656	1071	61%	5%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	947	1102	86%	969	1059	92%	6%									
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	893	1102	81%	933	1059	88%	7%									
BRI Fluency	2	436	1112	39%	529	1070	49%	10%	540	1074	50%	644	1064	61%	10%	0%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	2	266	1112	24%	279	1070	26%	2%	615	1074	57%	636	1064	60%	3%	0%	No Change
BRI Fluency	3	423	1140	37%	469	1036	45%	8%	468	1157	40%	504	1009	50%	10%	-1%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	582	1140	51%	540	1036	52%	1%	886	1157	77%	774	1009	77%	0%	1%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3								669	1143	59%	642	1007	64%	5%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3								631	1143	55%	589	1007	58%	3%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3								660	1143	58%	620	1007	62%	4%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3								447	1143	39%	457	1007	45%	6%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3								377	1143	33%	361	1007	36%	3%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3								411	1143	36%	416	1007	41%	5%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4								651	1046	62%	691	1013	68%	6%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4								635	1046	61%	596	1013	59%	-2%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4								664	1046	63%	668	1013	66%	2%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4								406	1046	39%	459	1013	45%	6%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4								427	1046	41%	415	1013	41%	0%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4								428	1046	41%	456	1013	45%	4%		

Note: *Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between Males and Females.

Table 11. Results for Students *With* and *Without* Economic Disadvantage

		FALL 2005							SPRING 2006								
		Students *without* Economic Disadvantage			Students *with* Economic Disadvantage			Fall Ach Gap*	Students *Without* an Economic Disadvantage			Students *With* an Economic Disadvantage			Spring Ach Gap*	% Change in Ach Gap	Direction of Change in Ach Gap
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof		N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof.			
PAT Rhyming	K	636	864	74%	783	1358	58%	16%	723	772	94%	1253	1422	88%	6%	10%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	503	864	58%	613	1358	45%	13%	669	772	87%	1062	1422	75%	12%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	504	864	58%	646	1358	48%	11%	692	772	90%	1176	1422	83%	7%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	759	805	94%	1200	1425	84%	10%	764	788	97%	1274	1425	89%	8%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	720	805	89%	1099	1425	77%	12%	749	788	95%	1236	1425	87%	8%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	728	805	90%	1151	1425	81%	10%	760	788	96%	1280	1425	90%	7%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	741	805	92%	1176	1425	83%	10%	777	788	99%	1362	1425	96%	3%	6%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	717	805	89%	1068	1425	75%	14%	766	788	97%	1343	1425	94%	3%	11%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	692	805	86%	1039	1425	73%	13%	755	788	96%	1269	1425	89%	7%	6%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	634	805	79%	929	1426	65%	14%	764	789	97%	1291	1425	91%	6%	7%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	602	805	75%	820	1426	58%	17%	744	789	94%	1214	1425	85%	9%	8%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1								547	787	70%	674	1414	48%	22%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1								560	787	71%	733	1414	52%	19%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	791	830	95%	1125	1331	85%	11%									
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	771	830	93%	1055	1331	79%	14%									
BRI Fluency	2	465	838	55%	500	1344	37%	18%	565	811	70%	619	1327	47%	23%	-5%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	305	838	36%	240	1344	18%	19%	563	811	69%	688	1327	52%	18%	1%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	3	443	876	51%	449	1300	35%	16%	470	840	56%	502	1326	38%	18%	-2%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	526	876	60%	596	1300	46%	14%	683	840	81%	977	1326	74%	8%	7%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3								609	839	73%	702	1311	54%	19%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3								605	839	72%	615	1311	47%	25%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3								619	839	74%	661	1311	50%	23%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3								472	839	56%	432	1311	33%	23%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3								422	839	50%	316	1311	24%	26%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3								460	839	55%	367	1311	28%	27%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4								633	818	77%	709	1241	57%	20%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4								632	818	77%	599	1241	48%	29%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4								652	818	80%	680	1241	55%	25%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4								453	818	55%	412	1241	33%	22%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4								479	818	59%	363	1241	29%	29%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4								488	818	60%	396	1241	32%	28%		

Note: *Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between Students *with* and *without* an Economic Disadvantage.

Table 12(a). Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (White Students and American Indian/Alaskan Native Students)

		White						American Indian or Alaskan Native									
		FALL 2005			SPRING 2006			FALL 2005				SPRING 2006				% Change in Ach Gap	Direction of Change in Ach Gap
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof	Fall Ach Gap*	N	Total	% Prof.	Spring Ach Gap*		
PAT Rhyming	K	1059	1453	73%	1347	1437	94%	22	44	50%	23%	42	48	88%	6%	17%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	841	1453	58%	1205	1437	84%	17	44	39%	19%	35	48	73%	11%	8%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	856	1453	59%	1275	1437	89%	20	44	45%	13%	40	48	83%	5%	8%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1332	1456	91%	1376	1449	95%	54	63	86%	6%	53	61	87%	8%	-2%	Widened
PAT Deletion	1	1259	1456	86%	1343	1449	93%	54	63	86%	1%	57	61	93%	-1%	0%	No Change
PAT Blending	1	1274	1456	88%	1369	1449	94%	55	63	87%	0%	57	61	93%	1%	-1%	Widened
PAT Segmentation	1	1292	1456	89%	1417	1449	98%	48	63	76%	13%	58	61	95%	3%	10%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1231	1456	85%	1395	1449	96%	47	63	75%	10%	58	61	95%	1%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1203	1456	83%	1362	1449	94%	51	63	81%	2%	59	61	97%	-3%	-1%	Widened
PAT Graphemes	1	1057	1457	73%	1365	1449	94%	34	63	54%	19%	59	61	97%	-3%	16%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	978	1457	67%	1310	1449	90%	43	63	68%	-1%	56	61	92%	-1%	0%	No Change
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1				880	1442	61%					23	60	38%	23%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1				925	1442	64%					20	60	33%	31%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1332	1451	92%				43	53	81%	11%						
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1292	1451	89%				40	53	75%	14%						
BRI Fluency	2	704	1464	48%	878	1449	61%	18	54	33%	15%	30	52	58%	3%	12%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	2	430	1464	29%	921	1449	64%	8	54	15%	15%	26	52	50%	14%	1%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	3	647	1451	45%	698	1438	49%	21	45	47%	-2%	22	47	47%	2%	0%	No Change
BRI Comprehension	3	838	1451	58%	1177	1438	82%	23	45	51%	7%	32	47	68%	14%	-7%	Widened
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3				958	1433	67%					25	43	58%	9%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3				943	1433	66%					23	43	53%	12%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3				966	1433	67%					24	43	56%	12%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3				705	1433	49%					19	43	44%	5%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3				624	1433	44%					13	43	30%	13%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3				672	1433	47%					17	43	40%	7%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4				1001	1436	70%					36	51	71%	-1%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4				973	1436	68%					30	51	59%	9%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4				1016	1436	71%					34	51	67%	4%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4				668	1436	47%					19	51	37%	9%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4				704	1436	49%					21	51	41%	8%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4				714	1436	50%					22	51	43%	7%		

Note: ***Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between White students and Native American Indian students.**

Table 12(b) Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (White Students and Asian Students)

		White						Asian									
		FALL 2005			SPRING 2006			FALL 2005				SPRING 2006				% Change in Ach Gap	Direction of Change in Ach Gap
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof	Fall Ach Gap*	N	Total	% Prof.	Spring Ach Gap*		
PAT Rhyming	K	1059	1453	73%	1347	1437	94%	33	71	46%	26%	59	66	89%	4%	22%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	841	1453	58%	1205	1437	84%	29	71	41%	17%	55	66	83%	1%	17%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	856	1453	59%	1275	1437	89%	22	71	31%	28%	55	66	83%	5%	23%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1332	1456	91%	1376	1449	95%	51	56	91%	0%	48	51	94%	1%	0%	No Change
PAT Deletion	1	1259	1456	86%	1343	1449	93%	49	56	88%	-1%	49	51	96%	-3%	-2%	Widened
PAT Blending	1	1274	1456	88%	1369	1449	94%	49	56	88%	0%	48	51	94%	0%	0%	No Change
PAT Segmentation	1	1292	1456	89%	1417	1449	98%	50	56	89%	-1%	49	51	96%	2%	-1%	Widened
PAT Isolation	1	1231	1456	85%	1395	1449	96%	49	56	88%	-3%	50	51	98%	-2%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1203	1456	83%	1362	1449	94%	44	56	79%	4%	49	51	96%	-2%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1057	1457	73%	1365	1449	94%	52	56	93%	-20%	51	51	100%	-6%	15%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	978	1457	67%	1310	1449	90%	46	56	82%	-15%	51	51	100%	-10%	5%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1				880	1442	61%					31	51	61%	0%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1				925	1442	64%					29	51	57%	7%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1332	1451	92%				43	50	86%	6%						
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1292	1451	89%				45	50	90%	-1%						
BRI Fluency	2	704	1464	48%	878	1449	61%	32	50	64%	-16%	29	49	59%	1%	15%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	2	430	1464	29%	921	1449	64%	7	50	14%	15%	28	49	57%	6%	9%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	3	647	1451	45%	698	1438	49%	27	65	42%	3%	35	66	53%	-4%	-1%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	838	1451	58%	1177	1438	82%	31	65	48%	10%	48	66	73%	9%	1%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3				958	1433	67%					37	62	60%	7%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3				943	1433	66%					27	62	44%	22%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3				966	1433	67%					32	62	52%	16%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3				705	1433	49%					21	62	34%	15%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3				624	1433	44%					13	62	21%	23%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3				672	1433	47%					17	62	27%	19%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4				1001	1436	70%					29	47	62%	8%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4				973	1436	68%					25	47	53%	15%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4				1016	1436	71%					31	47	66%	5%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4				668	1436	47%					19	47	40%	6%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4				704	1436	49%					12	47	26%	23%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4				714	1436	50%					15	47	32%	18%		

Note: ***Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between White students and Asian students.**

Table 12(c) Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (White Students and African American/Black Students)

		White						Black or African American									
		FALL 2005			SPRING 2006			FALL 2005				SPRING 2006					
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof	Fall Ach Gap*	N	Total	% Prof.	Spring Ach Gap*	% Change in Ach Gap	Direction of Change in Ach Gap
PAT Rhyming	K	1059	1453	73%	1347	1437	94%	147	245	60%	13%	205	229	90%	4%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	841	1453	58%	1205	1437	84%	107	245	44%	14%	170	229	74%	10%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	856	1453	59%	1275	1437	89%	98	245	40%	19%	169	229	74%	15%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1332	1456	91%	1376	1449	95%	218	249	88%	4%	227	247	92%	3%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	1259	1456	86%	1343	1449	93%	177	249	71%	15%	196	247	79%	13%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	1274	1456	88%	1369	1449	94%	178	249	71%	16%	201	247	81%	13%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1292	1456	89%	1417	1449	98%	210	249	84%	4%	234	247	95%	3%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1231	1456	85%	1395	1449	96%	164	249	66%	19%	219	247	89%	8%	11%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1203	1456	83%	1362	1449	94%	158	249	63%	19%	195	247	79%	15%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1057	1457	73%	1365	1449	94%	162	249	65%	7%	206	247	83%	11%	-3%	Widened
PAT Decoding	1	978	1457	67%	1310	1449	90%	135	249	54%	13%	193	247	78%	12%	1%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1				880	1442	61%					92	243	38%	23%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1				925	1442	64%					126	243	52%	12%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1332	1451	92%				173	217	80%	12%						
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1292	1451	89%				150	217	69%	20%						
BRI Fluency	2	704	1464	48%	878	1449	61%	71	221	32%	16%	78	212	37%	24%	-8%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	430	1464	29%	921	1449	64%	45	221	20%	9%	107	212	50%	13%	-4%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	647	1451	45%	698	1438	49%	66	233	28%	16%	66	219	30%	18%	-2%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	838	1451	58%	1177	1438	82%	98	233	42%	16%	154	219	70%	12%	4%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3				958	1433	67%					94	222	42%	25%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3				943	1433	66%					72	222	32%	33%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3				966	1433	67%					79	222	36%	32%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3				705	1433	49%					51	222	23%	26%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3				624	1433	44%					37	222	17%	27%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3				672	1433	47%					44	222	20%	27%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4				1001	1436	70%					95	191	50%	20%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4				973	1436	68%					73	191	38%	30%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4				1016	1436	71%					86	191	45%	26%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4				668	1436	47%					57	191	30%	17%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4				704	1436	49%					38	191	20%	29%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4				714	1436	50%					47	191	25%	25%		

Note: ***Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between White students and African-American students.**

Table 12(d) Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (White Students and Hispanic/Latino Students)

		White						Hispanic or Latino									
		FALL 2005			SPRING 2006			FALL 2005				SPRING 2006					
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof	Fall Ach Gap*	N	Total	% Prof.	Spring Ach Gap*	% Change in Ach Gap	Direction of Change in Ach Gap
PAT Rhyming	K	1059	1453	73%	1347	1437	94%	158	409	39%	34%	323	414	78%	16%	19%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	841	1453	58%	1205	1437	84%	122	409	30%	28%	266	414	64%	20%	8%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	856	1453	59%	1275	1437	89%	154	409	38%	21%	329	414	79%	9%	12%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1332	1456	91%	1376	1449	95%	304	406	75%	17%	334	405	82%	12%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	1259	1456	86%	1343	1449	93%	280	406	69%	18%	340	405	84%	9%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	1274	1456	88%	1369	1449	94%	323	406	80%	8%	365	405	90%	4%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1292	1456	89%	1417	1449	98%	317	406	78%	11%	381	405	94%	4%	7%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1231	1456	85%	1395	1449	96%	294	406	72%	12%	387	405	96%	1%	11%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1203	1456	83%	1362	1449	94%	275	406	68%	15%	359	405	89%	5%	10%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1057	1457	73%	1365	1449	94%	258	406	64%	9%	374	406	92%	2%	7%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	978	1457	67%	1310	1449	90%	220	406	54%	13%	348	406	86%	5%	8%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1				880	1442	61%					195	405	48%	13%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1				925	1442	64%					193	405	48%	16%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1332	1451	92%				325	390	83%	8%						
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1292	1451	89%				299	390	77%	12%						
BRI Fluency	2	704	1464	48%	878	1449	61%	140	393	36%	12%	169	376	45%	16%	-3%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	430	1464	29%	921	1449	64%	55	393	14%	15%	169	376	45%	19%	-3%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	647	1451	45%	698	1438	49%	131	382	34%	10%	151	396	38%	10%	0%	No Change
BRI Comprehension	3	838	1451	58%	1177	1438	82%	132	382	35%	23%	249	396	63%	19%	4%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3				958	1433	67%					197	390	51%	16%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3				943	1433	66%					155	390	40%	26%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3				966	1433	67%					179	390	46%	22%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3				705	1433	49%					108	390	28%	22%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3				624	1433	44%					51	390	13%	30%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3				672	1433	47%					77	390	20%	27%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4				1001	1436	70%					181	334	54%	16%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4				973	1436	68%					130	334	39%	29%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4				1016	1436	71%					165	334	49%	21%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4				668	1436	47%					102	334	31%	16%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4				704	1436	49%					67	334	20%	29%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4				714	1436	50%					86	334	26%	24%		

Note: ***Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between White students and Hispanic/Latino students.**

Table 13. Results for Students *With* and *Without* Disabilities

		FALL 2005							SPRING 2006								
		Students *without* Disablities			Students *with* Disabilities			Fall	Students W*ithout* Disablities			Students *With* Disabilities			Spring	% Change in	Direction of
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	Ach Gap*	N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof.	Ach Gap*	Ach Gap	Change in Ach Gap
PAT Rhyming	K	1353	2082	65%	66	140	47%	18%	1854	2023	92%	122	171	71%	20%	-2%	Widened
PAT Deletion	K	1072	2082	51%	44	140	31%	20%	1645	2023	81%	86	171	50%	31%	-11%	Widened
PAT Blending	K	1112	2082	53%	38	140	27%	26%	1761	2023	87%	107	171	63%	24%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1805	2011	90%	154	219	70%	19%	1841	1957	94%	197	256	77%	17%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	1682	2011	84%	137	219	63%	21%	1805	1957	92%	180	256	70%	22%	-1%	Widened
PAT Blending	1	1733	2011	86%	146	219	67%	20%	1852	1957	95%	188	256	73%	21%	-2%	Widened
PAT Segmentation	1	1768	2011	88%	149	219	68%	20%	1922	1957	98%	217	256	85%	13%	6%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1667	2011	83%	118	219	54%	29%	1907	1957	97%	202	256	79%	19%	10%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1603	2011	80%	128	219	58%	21%	1836	1957	94%	188	256	73%	20%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1463	2010	73%	100	221	45%	28%	1867	1958	95%	188	256	73%	22%	6%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	1338	2010	67%	84	221	38%	29%	1796	1958	92%	162	256	63%	28%	0%	No Change
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1								1150	1950	59%	71	251	28%	31%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1								1219	1950	63%	74	251	29%	33%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1747	1887	93%	169	274	62%	31%									
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1680	1887	89%	146	274	53%	36%									
BRI Fluency	2	904	1906	47%	61	276	22%	25%	1113	1818	61%	71	320	22%	39%	-14%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	519	1906	27%	26	276	9%	18%	1158	1818	64%	93	320	29%	35%	-17%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	849	1868	45%	43	308	14%	31%	930	1834	51%	42	332	13%	38%	-7%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	1059	1868	57%	63	308	20%	36%	1506	1834	82%	154	332	46%	36%	1%	No change
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3								1238	1820	68%	73	330	22%	46%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3								1134	1820	62%	86	330	26%	36%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3								1201	1820	66%	79	330	24%	42%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3								862	1820	47%	42	330	13%	35%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3								703	1820	39%	35	330	11%	28%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3								793	1820	44%	34	330	10%	33%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4								1256	1707	74%	86	352	24%	49%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4								1144	1707	67%	87	352	25%	42%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4								1245	1707	73%	87	352	25%	48%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4								832	1707	49%	33	352	9%	39%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4								804	1707	47%	38	352	11%	36%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4								852	1707	50%	32	352	9%	41%		

Note: *Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between Students *with* and *without* Disabilities.

Table 14. Results for Students *With* and *Without* Limited English Proficiency

		FALL 2005							SPRING 2006								
		Students *Without* Limited English Proficiency			Students *With* Limited English Proficiency			Fall Ach Gap*	Students *Without* Limited English Proficiency			Students *With* Limited English Proficiency			Spring Ach Gap*	% Change in Ach Gap	Direction of Change in Ach Gap
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof		N	Total	% Prof.	N	Total	% Prof.			
PAT Rhyming	K	1351	1974	68%	68	248	27%	41%	1723	1855	93%	253	339	75%	18%	23%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	1061	1974	54%	55	248	22%	32%	1522	1855	82%	209	339	62%	20%	11%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	1088	1974	55%	62	248	25%	30%	1601	1855	86%	267	339	79%	8%	23%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1719	1897	91%	240	333	72%	19%	1770	1878	94%	268	335	80%	14%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	1596	1897	84%	223	333	67%	17%	1707	1878	91%	278	335	83%	8%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	1621	1897	85%	258	333	77%	8%	1740	1878	93%	300	335	90%	3%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1662	1897	88%	255	333	77%	11%	1829	1878	97%	310	335	93%	5%	6%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1548	1897	82%	237	333	71%	10%	1792	1878	95%	317	335	95%	1%	10%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1509	1897	80%	222	333	67%	13%	1729	1878	92%	295	335	88%	4%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1342	1898	71%	221	333	66%	4%	1746	1879	93%	309	335	92%	1%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	1234	1898	65%	188	333	56%	9%	1669	1879	89%	289	335	86%	3%	6%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1								1056	1866	57%	165	335	49%	7%		
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1								1136	1866	61%	157	335	47%	14%		
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1663	1856	90%	253	305	83%	7%									
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1590	1856	86%	236	305	77%	8%									
BRI Fluency	2	854	1876	46%	111	306	36%	9%	1065	1858	57%	119	280	43%	15%	-6%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	504	1876	27%	41	306	13%	13%	1128	1858	61%	123	280	44%	17%	-3%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	786	1865	42%	106	311	34%	8%	841	1846	46%	131	320	41%	5%	3%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	3	1026	1865	55%	96	311	31%	24%	1470	1846	80%	190	320	59%	20%	4%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3								1160	1837	63%	151	313	48%	15%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3								1123	1837	61%	97	313	31%	30%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3								1152	1837	63%	128	313	41%	22%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3								827	1837	45%	77	313	25%	20%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3								706	1837	38%	32	313	10%	28%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3								776	1837	42%	51	313	16%	26%		
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4								1219	1805	68%	123	254	48%	19%		
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4								1150	1805	64%	81	254	32%	32%		
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4								1221	1805	68%	111	254	44%	24%		
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4								804	1805	45%	61	254	24%	21%		
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4								809	1805	45%	33	254	13%	32%		
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4								838	1805	46%	46	254	18%	28%		

Note: *Ach Gap reflects achievement gap between students *with* and *without* Limited English Proficiency.

Table 15. Special Education Data (2005-2006)

	FALL 2005					
	Students Currently Receiving Special Education Services		Percentage of Students Referred for Pre-referral services		Students Placed in Special Education Services	
Grade	N	Total	N	% Referred	N	% Placed
K	128	2035	12	1%	1	0%
1	204	2059	69	3%	4	0%
2	252	2040	85	4%	7	0%
3	289	2044	95	5%	6	0%
4	247	1523	68	4%	6	0%

	SPRING 2006					
	Students Currently Receiving Special Education Services		Percentage of Students Referred for Pre-referral services		Students Placed in Special Education Services	
Grade	N	Total	N	% Referred	N	% Placed
K	174	2211	74	3%	8	0%
1	251	2224	83	4%	14	1%
2	321	2148	124	6%	36	2%
3	335	2183	98	4%	22	1%
4	359	2087	67	3%	17	1%

Table 16. Percentage of Students Proficient by Assessment and Grade in Fall 2003 and Spring 2006.

Assessment	Grade	FALL 2003 (YEAR1) All Students N	Total	% Prof	SPRING 2006 (YEAR3) All Students N	Total	% Prof	% Change in Prof
PAT Rhyming	K	1251	2281	55%	1977	2195	90%	35%
PAT Deletion	K	1125	2281	49%	1732	2195	79%	30%
PAT Blending	K	1045	2281	46%	1869	2195	85%	39%
PAT Rhyming	1	1454	2234	65%	2039	2214	92%	27%
PAT Deletion	1	1257	2234	56%	1985	2214	90%	33%
PAT Blending	1	1329	2234	59%	2041	2214	92%	33%
PAT Segmentation	1	1471	2234	66%	2140	2214	97%	31%
PAT Isolation	1	1421	2234	64%	2110	2214	95%	32%
PAT Substitution	1	1351	2234	60%	2025	2214	91%	31%
PAT Graphemes	1	1305	2184	60%	2056	2215	93%	33%
PAT Decoding	1	1187	2184	54%	1959	2215	88%	34%
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1	864	2201	39%	1221	2202	55%	16%
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1	1019	2201	46%	1294	2202	59%	12%
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1427	2065	69%	1916	2161	89%	20%
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1343	2065	65%	1826	2161	84%	19%
BRI Fluency	2	843	2129	40%	1184	2138	55%	16%
BRI Comprehension	2	448	2129	21%	1251	2138	59%	37%
BRI Fluency	3	800	2174	37%	972	2166	45%	8%
BRI Comprehension	3	1003	2174	37%	1660	2166	77%	40%
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	1274	2128	37%	1311	2150	61%	24%
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1284	2128	37%	1220	2150	57%	20%
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1287	2128	37%	1280	2150	60%	23%
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1431	2290	62%	1342	2059	65%	3%
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1299	2290	57%	1231	2059	60%	3%
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1398	2290	61%	1332	2059	65%	4%

Table 17. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap by Gender.

		FALL 2003						SPRING 2006						Percent Increase in Proficiency		Achievement Gap*		Direction of Change in Achievement Gap
		MALES			FEMALES			MALES			FEMALES							
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	Male Students	Female Students	F2003	S2006	
PAT Rhyming	K	618	1150	54%	633	1131	56%	963	1088	89%	1014	1107	92%	35%	36%	2%	3%	Widened
PAT Deletion	K	547	1150	48%	578	1131	51%	827	1088	76%	905	1107	82%	28%	31%	4%	6%	Widened
PAT Blending	K	490	1150	43%	555	1131	49%	904	1088	83%	965	1107	87%	40%	38%	6%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	740	1177	63%	714	1057	68%	1036	1137	91%	1003	1077	93%	28%	26%	5%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	636	1177	54%	621	1057	59%	1003	1137	88%	982	1077	91%	34%	32%	5%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	645	1177	55%	684	1057	65%	1035	1137	91%	1006	1077	93%	36%	29%	10%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	739	1177	63%	732	1057	69%	1095	1137	96%	1045	1077	97%	34%	28%	6%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	689	1177	59%	732	1057	69%	1065	1137	94%	1045	1077	97%	35%	28%	11%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	673	1177	57%	678	1057	64%	1040	1137	91%	985	1077	91%	34%	27%	7%	0%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	611	1145	53%	694	1039	67%	1040	1138	91%	1016	1077	94%	38%	28%	13%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	562	1145	49%	625	1039	60%	985	1138	87%	974	1077	90%	37%	30%	11%	4%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1	397	1167	34%	467	1034	45%	572	1130	51%	649	1072	61%	17%	15%	11%	10%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1	503	1167	43%	516	1034	50%	637	1130	56%	657	1072	61%	13%	11%	7%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	703	1064	66%	724	1001	72%	947	1102	86%	969	1059	92%	20%	19%	6%	6%	No Change
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	669	1064	63%	674	1001	67%	893	1102	81%	933	1059	88%	18%	21%	4%	7%	Widened
BRI Fluency	2	399	1096	36%	442	1028	43%	540	1074	50%	644	1064	61%	14%	18%	7%	10%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	226	1096	21%	222	1028	22%	615	1074	57%	636	1064	60%	37%	38%	1%	3%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	384	1118	34%	416	1051	40%	468	1157	40%	504	1009	50%	6%	10%	5%	10%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	506	1118	45%	497	1051	47%	886	1157	77%	774	1009	77%	31%	29%	2%	0%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	617	1104	56%	656	1023	64%	669	1143	59%	642	1007	64%	3%	0%	8%	5%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	648	1104	59%	636	1023	62%	631	1143	55%	589	1007	58%	-3%	-4%	3%	3%	No Change
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	641	1104	58%	646	1023	63%	660	1143	58%	620	1007	62%	0%	-2%	5%	4%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	692	1174	59%	726	1099	66%	651	1046	62%	691	1013	68%	3%	2%	7%	6%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	672	1174	57%	617	1099	56%	635	1046	61%	596	1013	59%	3%	3%	-1%	-2%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	699	1174	60%	687	1099	63%	664	1046	63%	668	1013	66%	4%	3%	3%	2%	Narrowed

Note: *Achievement Gap reflects the gap between Male and Female Students.

Table 18. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap by Students *With* and *Without* an Economic Disadvantage..

		FALL 2003						SPRING 2006						Percent Increase in Proficiency		Achievement Gap*		Direction of Change in Achievement Gap
		Students *without* Economic Disadvantage			Students *with* Economic Disadvantage			Students *without* Economic Disadvantage			Students *with* Economic Disadvantage							
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	*w/o* Econ Disadv	*w/* Econ Disadv	F2003	S2006	
PAT Rhyming	K	669	1010	66%	582	1271	46%	723	772	94%	1254	1423	88%	27%	42%	-20%	-6%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	595	1010	59%	530	1271	42%	669	772	87%	1063	1423	75%	28%	33%	-17%	-12%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	538	1010	53%	507	1271	40%	692	772	90%	1177	1423	83%	36%	43%	-13%	-7%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	705	967	73%	749	1267	59%	764	788	97%	1275	1426	89%	24%	30%	-14%	-8%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	618	967	64%	639	1267	50%	749	788	95%	1236	1426	87%	31%	36%	-13%	-8%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	651	967	67%	678	1267	54%	760	788	96%	1281	1426	90%	29%	36%	-14%	-7%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	698	967	72%	773	1267	61%	777	788	99%	1363	1426	96%	26%	35%	-11%	-3%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	715	967	74%	706	1267	56%	766	788	97%	1344	1426	94%	23%	39%	-18%	-3%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	650	967	67%	701	1267	55%	755	788	96%	1270	1426	89%	29%	34%	-12%	-7%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	627	942	67%	678	1242	55%	764	789	97%	1292	1426	91%	30%	36%	-12%	-6%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	576	942	61%	611	1242	49%	744	789	94%	1215	1426	85%	33%	36%	-12%	-9%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1	476	982	48%	388	1219	32%	547	787	70%	674	1415	48%	21%	16%	-17%	-22%	Widened
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1	540	982	55%	479	1219	39%	560	787	71%	734	1415	52%	16%	13%	-16%	-19%	Widened
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	675	860	78%	752	1205	62%	791	830	95%	1125	1331	85%	17%	22%	-16%	-11%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	643	860	75%	700	1205	58%	771	830	93%	1055	1331	79%	18%	21%	-17%	-14%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	2	457	906	50%	386	1223	32%	565	811	70%	619	1327	47%	19%	15%	-19%	-23%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	268	906	30%	180	1223	15%	563	811	69%	688	1327	52%	40%	37%	-15%	-18%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	414	959	43%	386	1215	32%	470	840	56%	502	1326	38%	13%	6%	-11%	-18%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	510	959	53%	493	1215	41%	683	840	81%	977	1326	74%	28%	33%	-13%	-8%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	652	937	70%	622	1191	52%	609	839	73%	702	1311	54%	3%	1%	-17%	-19%	Widened
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	661	937	71%	623	1191	52%	605	839	72%	615	1311	47%	2%	-5%	-18%	-25%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	662	937	71%	625	1191	52%	619	839	74%	661	1311	50%	3%	-2%	-18%	-23%	Widened
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	872	1218	72%	556	1066	52%	633	818	77%	709	1241	57%	6%	5%	-19%	-20%	Widened
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	826	1218	68%	470	1066	44%	632	818	77%	599	1241	48%	9%	4%	-24%	-29%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	871	1218	72%	524	1066	49%	652	818	80%	680	1241	55%	8%	6%	-22%	-25%	Widened

Note: *Achievement Gap reflects the gap between Students *with* and *without* an Economic Disadvantage.

Table 19a. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap between White Students and American Indian/Alaskan Native Students.

		White							American Indian or Alaskan Native									
		Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change	Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change	Ach Gap[1]		Ach Gap
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	F2003	S2006	Direction[1]
PAT Rhyming	K	971	1542	1347	1437	63%	94%	31%	25	62	42	48	40%	69%	29%	23%	25%	Widened
PAT Deletion	K	882	1542	1205	1437	57%	84%	27%	27	62	35	48	44%	73%	29%	14%	11%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	784	1542	1275	1437	51%	89%	38%	24	62	40	48	39%	83%	45%	12%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1032	1490	1376	1449	69%	95%	26%	31	55	53	61	56%	87%	31%	13%	8%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	911	1490	1343	1449	61%	93%	32%	30	55	57	61	55%	93%	39%	7%	-1%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	936	1490	1369	1449	63%	94%	32%	39	55	57	61	71%	93%	23%	-8%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1029	1490	1417	1449	69%	98%	29%	38	55	58	61	69%	95%	26%	0%	3%	Widened
PAT Isolation	1	1021	1490	1395	1449	69%	96%	28%	35	55	58	61	64%	95%	31%	5%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	985	1490	1362	1449	66%	94%	28%	24	55	59	61	44%	97%	53%	22%	-3%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	907	1448	1365	1449	63%	94%	32%	35	55	59	61	64%	97%	33%	-1%	-3%	Widened
PAT Decoding	1	827	1448	1310	1449	57%	90%	33%	30	55	56	61	55%	92%	37%	3%	-1%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	1	646	1462	880	1442	44%	61%	17%	15	52	23	60	29%	38%	9%	15%	23%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	1	766	1462	925	1442	52%	64%	12%	14	52	20	60	27%	33%	6%	25%	31%	Widened
PAT Graphemes	2	1007	1414	1332	1451	71%	92%	21%	49	58	43	53	84%	81%	-3%	-13%	11%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	2	951	1414	1292	1451	67%	89%	22%	42	58	40	53	72%	75%	3%	-5%	14%	Widened
BRI Fluency	2	630	1460	878	1449	43%	61%	17%	22	59	30	52	37%	58%	20%	6%	3%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	2	374	1460	921	1449	26%	64%	38%	11	59	26	52	19%	50%	31%	7%	14%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	599	1502	698	1438	40%	49%	9%	20	52	22	47	38%	47%	8%	1%	2%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	787	1502	1177	1438	52%	82%	29%	17	52	32	47	33%	68%	35%	20%	14%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	981	1491	958	1433	66%	67%	1%	22	50	25	43	44%	58%	14%	22%	9%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1035	1491	943	1433	69%	66%	-4%	23	50	23	43	46%	53%	7%	23%	12%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1024	1491	966	1433	69%	67%	-1%	23	50	24	43	46%	56%	10%	23%	12%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3	787	1491	705	1433	53%	49%	-4%	13	50	19	43	26%	44%	18%	27%	5%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3	710	1491	624	1433	48%	44%	-4%	9	50	13	43	18%	30%	12%	30%	13%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3	745	1491	672	1433	50%	47%	-3%	13	50	17	43	26%	40%	14%	24%	7%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1086	1583	1001	1436	69%	70%	1%	36	61	36	51	59%	71%	12%	10%	-1%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1049	1583	973	1436	66%	68%	1%	32	61	30	51	52%	59%	6%	14%	9%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1091	1583	1016	1436	69%	71%	2%	36	61	34	51	59%	67%	8%	10%	4%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4	854	1583	668	1436	54%	47%	-7%	25	61	19	51	41%	37%	-4%	13%	9%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4	764	1583	704	1436	48%	49%	1%	19	61	21	51	31%	41%	10%	17%	8%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4	845	1583	714	1436	53%	50%	-4%	21	61	22	51	34%	43%	9%	19%	7%	Narrowed

Note: Achievement Gap reflects gap between White students and American Indian[1] Students

Table 19b. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap between White Students and Asian Students.

		White							Asian							Ach Gap[2]		Ach Gap
		Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change	Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change			
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	F2003	S2006	Direction[2]
PAT Rhyming	K	971	1542	1347	1437	63%	94%	31%	22	54	59	66	41%	89%	49%	22%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	882	1542	1205	1437	57%	84%	27%	20	54	55	66	37%	83%	46%	20%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	784	1542	1275	1437	51%	89%	38%	19	54	55	66	35%	83%	48%	16%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1032	1490	1376	1449	69%	95%	26%	48	70	48	51	69%	94%	26%	1%	1%	No Change
PAT Deletion	1	911	1490	1343	1449	61%	93%	32%	29	70	49	51	41%	96%	55%	20%	-3%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	936	1490	1369	1449	63%	94%	32%	28	70	48	51	40%	94%	54%	23%	0%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1029	1490	1417	1449	69%	98%	29%	50	70	49	51	71%	96%	25%	-2%	2%	No Change
PAT Isolation	1	1021	1490	1395	1449	69%	96%	28%	32	70	50	51	46%	98%	52%	23%	-2%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	985	1490	1362	1449	66%	94%	28%	24	70	49	51	34%	96%	62%	32%	-2%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	907	1448	1365	1449	63%	94%	32%	39	70	51	51	56%	100%	44%	7%	-6%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	827	1448	1310	1449	57%	90%	33%	33	70	51	51	47%	100%	53%	10%	-10%	No Change
BRI Fluency	1	646	1462	880	1442	44%	61%	17%	33	69	31	51	48%	61%	13%	-4%	0%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	1	766	1462	925	1442	52%	64%	12%	34	69	29	51	49%	57%	8%	3%	7%	Widened
PAT Graphemes	2	1007	1414	1332	1451	71%	92%	21%	37	52	43	50	71%	86%	15%	0%	6%	Widened
PAT Decoding	2	951	1414	1292	1451	67%	89%	22%	37	52	45	50	71%	90%	19%	-4%	-1%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	2	630	1460	878	1449	43%	61%	17%	31	54	29	49	57%	59%	2%	-14%	1%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	2	374	1460	921	1449	26%	64%	38%	8	54	28	49	15%	57%	42%	11%	6%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	3	599	1502	698	1438	40%	49%	9%	30	67	35	66	45%	53%	8%	-5%	-4%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	3	787	1502	1177	1438	52%	82%	29%	18	67	48	66	27%	73%	46%	26%	9%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	981	1491	958	1433	66%	67%	1%	33	66	37	62	50%	60%	10%	16%	7%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1035	1491	943	1433	69%	66%	-4%	27	66	27	62	41%	44%	3%	29%	22%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1024	1491	966	1433	69%	67%	-1%	30	66	32	62	45%	52%	6%	23%	16%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3	787	1491	705	1433	53%	49%	-4%	22	66	21	62	33%	34%	1%	19%	15%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3	710	1491	624	1433	48%	44%	-4%	18	66	13	62	27%	21%	-6%	20%	23%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3	745	1491	672	1433	50%	47%	-3%	21	66	17	62	32%	27%	-4%	18%	19%	Widened
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1086	1583	1001	1436	69%	70%	1%	37	64	29	47	58%	62%	4%	11%	8%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1049	1583	973	1436	66%	68%	1%	25	64	25	47	39%	53%	14%	27%	15%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1091	1583	1016	1436	69%	71%	2%	32	64	31	47	50%	66%	16%	19%	5%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4	854	1583	668	1436	54%	47%	-7%	25	64	19	47	39%	40%	1%	15%	6%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4	764	1583	704	1436	48%	49%	1%	18	64	12	47	28%	26%	-3%	20%	23%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4	845	1583	714	1436	53%	50%	-4%	21	64	15	47	33%	32%	-1%	21%	18%	Narrowed

Note: Achievement Gap reflects gap between White students and Asian [2] Students

Table 19c. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap between White Students and African American/Black Students.

		White							Black or African American							Ach Gap[3]		Ach Gap Direction[3]
		Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change	Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change			
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	F2003	S2006	
PAT Rhyming	K	971	1542	1347	1437	63%	94%	31%	122	249	206	230	49%	90%	41%	14%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	882	1542	1205	1437	57%	84%	27%	103	249	171	230	41%	74%	33%	16%	10%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	784	1542	1275	1437	51%	89%	38%	95	249	170	230	38%	74%	36%	13%	15%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1032	1490	1376	1449	69%	95%	26%	159	230	228	248	69%	92%	23%	0%	3%	Widened
PAT Deletion	1	911	1490	1343	1449	61%	93%	32%	112	230	196	248	49%	79%	30%	12%	14%	Widened
PAT Blending	1	936	1490	1369	1449	63%	94%	32%	118	230	202	248	51%	81%	30%	12%	13%	Widened
PAT Segmentation	1	1029	1490	1417	1449	69%	98%	29%	140	230	235	248	61%	95%	34%	8%	3%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1021	1490	1395	1449	69%	96%	28%	123	230	220	248	53%	89%	35%	15%	8%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	985	1490	1362	1449	66%	94%	28%	119	230	196	248	52%	79%	27%	14%	15%	Widened
PAT Graphemes	1	907	1448	1365	1449	63%	94%	32%	121	218	207	248	56%	83%	28%	7%	11%	Widened
PAT Decoding	1	827	1448	1310	1449	57%	90%	33%	106	218	194	248	49%	78%	30%	8%	12%	Widened
BRI Fluency	1	646	1462	880	1442	44%	61%	17%	66	236	92	244	28%	38%	10%	16%	23%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	1	766	1462	925	1442	52%	64%	12%	92	236	127	244	39%	52%	13%	13%	12%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	2	1007	1414	1332	1451	71%	92%	21%	125	225	173	217	56%	80%	24%	16%	12%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	2	951	1414	1292	1451	67%	89%	22%	111	225	150	217	49%	69%	20%	18%	20%	Widened
BRI Fluency	2	630	1460	878	1449	43%	61%	17%	71	232	78	212	31%	37%	6%	13%	24%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	374	1460	921	1449	26%	64%	38%	26	232	107	212	11%	50%	39%	14%	13%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	3	599	1502	698	1438	40%	49%	9%	59	209	66	219	28%	30%	2%	12%	18%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	787	1502	1177	1438	52%	82%	29%	83	209	154	219	40%	70%	31%	13%	12%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	981	1491	958	1433	66%	67%	1%	89	195	94	222	46%	42%	-3%	20%	25%	Widened
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1035	1491	943	1433	69%	66%	-4%	81	195	72	222	42%	32%	-9%	28%	33%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1024	1491	966	1433	69%	67%	-1%	81	195	79	222	42%	36%	-6%	27%	32%	Widened
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3	787	1491	705	1433	53%	49%	-4%	61	195	51	222	31%	23%	-8%	22%	26%	Widened
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3	710	1491	624	1433	48%	44%	-4%	44	195	37	222	23%	17%	-6%	25%	27%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3	745	1491	672	1433	50%	47%	-3%	49	195	44	222	25%	20%	-5%	25%	27%	Widened
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1086	1583	1001	1436	69%	70%	1%	105	221	95	191	48%	50%	2%	21%	20%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1049	1583	973	1436	66%	68%	1%	82	221	73	191	37%	38%	1%	29%	30%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1091	1583	1016	1436	69%	71%	2%	98	221	86	191	44%	45%	1%	25%	26%	Widened
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4	854	1583	668	1436	54%	47%	-7%	68	221	57	191	31%	30%	-1%	23%	17%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4	764	1583	704	1436	48%	49%	1%	47	221	38	191	21%	20%	-1%	27%	29%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4	845	1583	714	1436	53%	50%	-4%	53	221	47	191	24%	25%	1%	29%	25%	Narrowed

Note: Achievement Gap reflects gap between White students and African American/Black [3] Students

Table 19d. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap between White Students and Hispanic/Latino Students.

		White							Hispanic or Latino							Ach Gap[4]		Ach Gap Direction[4]
		Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change	Fall 2003		Spring 2006		% Proficient		% Change			
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	N	Total	N	Total	F2003	S2006	in Prof.	F2003	S2006	
PAT Rhyming	K	971	1542	1347	1437	63%	94%	31%	109	370	323	414	29%	78%	49%	34%	16%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	882	1542	1205	1437	57%	84%	27%	90	370	266	414	24%	64%	40%	33%	20%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	784	1542	1275	1437	51%	89%	38%	121	370	329	414	33%	79%	47%	18%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1032	1490	1376	1449	69%	95%	26%	181	385	334	405	47%	82%	35%	22%	12%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	911	1490	1343	1449	61%	93%	32%	173	385	340	405	45%	84%	39%	16%	9%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	936	1490	1369	1449	63%	94%	32%	206	385	365	405	54%	90%	37%	9%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1029	1490	1417	1449	69%	98%	29%	211	385	381	405	55%	94%	39%	14%	4%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1021	1490	1395	1449	69%	96%	28%	208	385	387	405	54%	96%	42%	14%	1%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	985	1490	1362	1449	66%	94%	28%	197	385	359	405	51%	89%	37%	15%	5%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	907	1448	1365	1449	63%	94%	32%	200	389	374	406	51%	92%	41%	11%	2%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	827	1448	1310	1449	57%	90%	33%	188	389	348	406	48%	86%	37%	9%	5%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	1	646	1462	880	1442	44%	61%	17%	101	379	195	405	27%	48%	21%	18%	13%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	1	766	1462	925	1442	52%	64%	12%	110	379	193	405	29%	48%	19%	23%	16%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	2	1007	1414	1332	1451	71%	92%	21%	209	314	325	390	67%	83%	17%	5%	8%	Widened
PAT Decoding	2	951	1414	1292	1451	67%	89%	22%	202	314	299	390	64%	77%	12%	3%	12%	Widened
BRI Fluency	2	630	1460	878	1449	43%	61%	17%	85	314	169	376	27%	45%	18%	16%	16%	No Change
BRI Comprehension	2	374	1460	921	1449	26%	64%	38%	28	314	169	376	9%	45%	36%	17%	19%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	599	1502	698	1438	40%	49%	9%	90	332	151	396	27%	38%	11%	13%	10%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	3	787	1502	1177	1438	52%	82%	29%	94	332	249	396	28%	63%	35%	24%	19%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	981	1491	958	1433	66%	67%	1%	145	320	197	390	45%	51%	5%	20%	16%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1035	1491	943	1433	69%	66%	-4%	115	320	155	390	36%	40%	4%	33%	26%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1024	1491	966	1433	69%	67%	-1%	126	320	179	390	39%	46%	7%	29%	22%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3	787	1491	705	1433	53%	49%	-4%	103	320	108	390	32%	28%	-4%	21%	22%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3	710	1491	624	1433	48%	44%	-4%	56	320	51	390	18%	13%	-4%	30%	30%	No Change
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3	745	1491	672	1433	50%	47%	-3%	73	320	77	390	23%	20%	-3%	27%	27%	No Change
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1086	1583	1001	1436	69%	70%	1%	150	336	181	334	45%	54%	10%	24%	16%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1049	1583	973	1436	66%	68%	1%	98	336	130	334	29%	39%	10%	37%	29%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1091	1583	1016	1436	69%	71%	2%	126	336	165	334	38%	49%	12%	31%	21%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4	854	1583	668	1436	54%	47%	-7%	92	336	102	334	27%	31%	3%	27%	16%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4	764	1583	704	1436	48%	49%	1%	46	336	67	334	14%	20%	6%	35%	29%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4	845	1583	714	1436	53%	50%	-4%	59	336	86	334	18%	26%	8%	36%	24%	Narrowed

Note: Achievement Gap reflects gap between White students and Hispanic/Latino[4] Students

Table 20. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap by Students *With* and *Without* Disabilities.

		FALL 2003						SPRING 2006						Percent Increase in Proficiency		Achievement Gap*		Direction of Change in Achievement Gap
		Students *without* Disabilities			Students *with* Disabilities			Students *without* Disabilities			Students *with* Disabilities							
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	*w/o* Disabilities	*w/* Disabilities	F2003	S2006	
PAT Rhyming	K	1194	2065	58%	57	216	26%	1855	2024	92%	122	171	71%	34%	45%	32%	21%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	1060	2065	51%	65	216	30%	1646	2024	81%	86	171	50%	30%	20%	21%	31%	Widened
PAT Blending	K	993	2065	48%	52	216	24%	1762	2024	87%	107	171	63%	39%	39%	24%	24%	No Change
PAT Rhyming	1	1372	2017	68%	82	217	38%	1842	1958	94%	197	256	77%	26%	39%	30%	17%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	1209	2017	60%	48	217	22%	1805	1958	92%	180	256	70%	32%	48%	38%	22%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	1275	2017	63%	54	217	25%	1853	1958	95%	188	256	73%	32%	48%	38%	22%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1398	2017	69%	73	217	34%	1923	1958	98%	217	256	85%	29%	51%	35%	13%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1369	2017	68%	52	217	24%	1908	1958	97%	202	256	79%	29%	55%	44%	18%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1267	2017	63%	84	217	39%	1837	1958	94%	188	256	73%	31%	34%	24%	21%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1251	1972	63%	54	212	25%	1868	1959	95%	188	256	73%	32%	48%	38%	22%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	1143	1972	58%	44	212	21%	1797	1959	92%	162	256	63%	34%	42%	37%	29%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1	834	1989	42%	30	211	14%	1150	1951	59%	71	251	28%	17%	14%	28%	31%	Widened
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1	980	1989	49%	39	211	18%	1220	1951	63%	74	251	29%	14%	11%	31%	34%	Widened
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1345	1809	74%	82	256	32%	1747	1887	93%	169	274	62%	19%	30%	42%	31%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1280	1809	71%	63	256	25%	1680	1887	89%	146	274	53%	18%	28%	46%	36%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency	2	816	1867	44%	25	257	10%	1113	1818	61%	71	320	22%	17%	12%	34%	39%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	2	433	1867	23%	15	257	6%	1158	1818	64%	93	320	29%	41%	23%	17%	35%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	770	1882	41%	30	287	10%	930	1834	51%	42	332	13%	10%	3%	31%	38%	Widened
BRI Comprehension	3	959	1882	51%	44	287	15%	1506	1834	82%	154	332	46%	31%	31%	36%	36%	No Change
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	1211	1835	66%	62	292	21%	1238	1820	68%	73	330	22%	2%	1%	45%	46%	Widened
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1189	1835	65%	95	292	33%	1134	1820	62%	86	330	26%	-3%	-7%	32%	36%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1218	1835	66%	69	292	24%	1201	1820	66%	79	330	24%	0%	0%	42%	42%	No Change
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1350	1927	70%	68	346	20%	1256	1707	74%	86	352	24%	4%	4%	50%	50%	No Change
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1211	1927	63%	78	346	23%	1144	1707	67%	87	352	25%	4%	2%	40%	42%	Widened
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1323	1927	69%	63	346	18%	1245	1707	73%	87	352	25%	4%	7%	51%	48%	Narrowed

Note: *Achievement Gap reflects the gap between Students *with* and *without* Disabilities.

Table 21. Fall 2003/Spring 2006 Achievement Gap by Students *With* and *Without* Limited English Proficiency..

		FALL 2003						SPRING 2006						Percent Increase in Proficiency		Achievement Gap*		Direction of Change in Achievement Gap
		Students *without* Limited English Profciency (ELL)			Students *with* Limited English Profciency (ELL)			Students *without* Limited English Profciency (ELL)			Students *with* Limited English Profciency (ELL)							
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	N	Total	% Prof	*w/o* ELL	*w/* ELL	F2003	S2006	
PAT Rhyming	K	1185	2005	59%	66	276	24%	1724	1856	93%	253	339	75%	34%	51%	-35%	-18%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	K	1075	2005	54%	50	276	18%	1523	1856	82%	209	339	62%	28%	44%	-36%	-20%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	K	974	2005	49%	71	276	26%	1602	1856	86%	267	339	79%	38%	53%	-23%	-7%	Narrowed
PAT Rhyming	1	1370	2016	68%	84	218	39%	1771	1879	94%	268	335	80%	26%	41%	-29%	-14%	Narrowed
PAT Deletion	1	1180	2016	59%	77	218	35%	1707	1879	91%	278	335	83%	32%	48%	-24%	-8%	Narrowed
PAT Blending	1	1237	2016	61%	92	218	42%	1741	1879	93%	300	335	90%	31%	47%	-19%	-3%	Narrowed
PAT Segmentation	1	1367	2016	68%	104	218	48%	1830	1879	97%	310	335	93%	30%	45%	-20%	-4%	Narrowed
PAT Isolation	1	1329	2016	66%	92	218	42%	1793	1879	95%	317	335	95%	30%	52%	-24%	0%	Narrowed
PAT Substitution	1	1270	2016	63%	81	218	37%	1730	1879	92%	295	335	88%	29%	51%	-26%	-4%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes	1	1203	1962	61%	102	222	46%	1747	1880	93%	309	335	92%	32%	46%	-15%	-1%	Narrowed
PAT Decoding	1	1099	1962	56%	88	222	40%	1670	1880	89%	289	335	86%	33%	47%	-16%	-3%	Narrowed
BRI Fluency (Spring)	1	811	1983	41%	53	217	24%	1056	1867	57%	165	335	49%	16%	25%	-17%	-8%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension (Spring)	1	957	1983	48%	62	217	29%	1137	1867	61%	157	335	47%	13%	18%	-19%	-14%	Narrowed
PAT Graphemes (Fall)	2	1270	1822	70%	157	243	65%	1663	1856	90%	253	305	83%	20%	18%	-5%	-7%	Widened
PAT Decoding (Fall)	2	1191	1822	65%	152	243	63%	1590	1856	86%	236	305	77%	20%	15%	-2%	-9%	Widened
BRI Fluency	2	782	1882	42%	59	242	24%	1065	1858	57%	119	280	43%	16%	18%	-18%	-14%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	2	428	1882	23%	20	242	8%	1128	1858	61%	123	280	44%	38%	36%	-15%	-17%	Widened
BRI Fluency	3	743	1942	38%	57	227	25%	841	1846	46%	131	320	41%	7%	16%	-13%	-5%	Narrowed
BRI Comprehension	3	954	1942	49%	49	227	22%	1470	1846	80%	190	320	59%	31%	38%	-27%	-21%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	1188	1907	62%	85	220	39%	1160	1837	63%	151	313	48%	1%	10%	-23%	-15%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1222	1907	64%	62	220	28%	1123	1837	61%	97	313	31%	-3%	3%	-36%	-30%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1212	1907	64%	75	220	34%	1152	1837	63%	128	313	41%	-1%	7%	-30%	-22%	Narrowed
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1321	2028	65%	97	245	40%	1219	1805	68%	123	254	48%	2%	9%	-25%	-20%	Narrowed
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1238	2028	61%	51	245	21%	1150	1805	64%	81	254	32%	3%	11%	-40%	-32%	Narrowed
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1314	2028	65%	72	245	29%	1221	1805	68%	111	254	44%	3%	14%	-36%	-24%	Narrowed

Note: *Achievement Gap reflects the gap between Students *with* and *without* Limited English Proficient (ELL).

References

Hoover, H., Dunbar, S., Frisbie, D., Oberley, K., Bray, R., Naylor, J., Lewis, J., Ordman, V., & Qualls, A.L., (2003). *The Iowa Tests: Interpretive Guide for School Administrators.* Riverside, CA: Riverside Publishing.

Johns, J. (2001). *Basic Reading Inventory: Pre-primer through grade twelve and early literacy assessments*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Robertson, C. & Salter, W. (1997). *The Phonological Awareness Test.* East Moline, IL: LinguiSystems, Inc.